



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON THE HOMERIC CAESURA AND THE CLOSE OF THE VERSE AS RELATED TO THE EXPRESSION OF THOUGHT.

BY THOMAS D. SEYMOUR.

THE fundamental difference of form between Greek poetry and Latin poetry rests upon the important but often forgotten fact that the one was made for the ear and the other for the eye. The former was made to be sung or recited and *heard*, while the latter was made to be *read*. In the first centuries of its existence, the Iliad was read by few persons and heard by multitudes, while on the other hand only a comparatively small number ever heard the Aeneid recited from memory. The odes of Pindar and Sappho were sung; while the odes of Horace were published and sold by booksellers,—though Roman poetasters were fond of repeating their own compositions. On this fact rests the importance of the proper, lively scansion of Homer and Pindar. The mere division of the verse into feet profits little. A school-boy may so divide into feet the whole Iliad with no advantage, if he goes no further. Even to recite the poems in a mechanical way, does little good, except as it aids the learner in acquiring familiarity with meanings, forms, and constructions. Our ideal must be to listen to a Greek poem just as the old Greeks themselves listened to it. The pause of the reciter threw emphasis upon the word before the caesura, or at least made a distinct break, which is only imperfectly indicated in print by italics and dashes. The Roman poet, composing simply for the eye, could neglect the pauses, which were simply for the ear, and from which he could get no emphasis or expression. Much indeed of the beauty of Tennyson's poems and much of the charm of the odes of Horace would be lost if we were ignorant of the poet's rhythms and metres. But if familiarity with English and Latin rhythms is important for an appreciation of the poetry, much more should we expect to find in the rhythms of early Greek poems an aid to the discovery of the poet's intention.

Pindar's odes instead of being less intelligible (like our own poetry) when sung, seem to have been much easier of comprehension than when received simply by the eye. The careful student sees many marks of connexion and emphasis clearly indicated by the verse. Words which would seem widely separated if the poem were written as prose, are seen to be closely united by the rhythm.¹ It is often easier for syntactical construction to leap over two or three whole verses than part of a verse. The rhythm is constantly so used as to bring the poet's thought into stronger relief. The ancient poet was less tempted even than his modern brother to select the rhythm and metre of his verse at random.

In the early orators, too, passages are found which must have been far less ambiguous to the hearer than they are to him who reads them for the first time.²

Blass, who has done more than all others to recall and revive the rhythmical principles of the ancient rhetoricians and critics, and has added acute observations of his own, calls attention to the fact that obscurity would be a real fault in Demosthenes, if the

¹ Cf. Κλεόδαμον ὄφρ' ἴδουσ' υἱὸν εἴπῃς, ὅτι οἱ **νέαν**
κόλποις παρ' εὐδόξου Πίσας
ἔστεφάνωσε κυδίμων ἀέθλων περοῖσι **χαίταν** Pindar, *Ol.* xiv. 22 ff.

τεθμὸς δέ τις ἀθανάτων καὶ τάνδ' ἀλιερκέα **χώραν**
παντοδαποῖσιν ὑπέστασε ξένοις
κίονα δαιμονίαν ·
ὁ δ' ἐπαντέλλων χρόνος
τοῦτο πρᾶσσων μὴ κάμοι ·
Δωριεὶ λαῶ **ταμεινομέναν** ἐξ Αἰακοῦ *id.* *Ol.* viii. 25 ff.

κελαδησόμεθα **βροντὰν**
καὶ πυρπάλαιμον βέλος,
ὀρσικτύπου Διός,
ἐν ἅπαντι κράτει
αἰθωνα κεραυνὸν ἀραρότα *id.* *Ol.* x. 39 ff.

² Cf. Πύρρος, ἅπας ὧν γνησίων παίδων, ἐποίησατο "Ἐνδιον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἐμὸν υἱὸν ἐαυτῷ Isaeus iii. 1 (where the speaker certainly made a pause before υἱόν), ὅς γε ἐτόλμησε μαρτυρῆσαι ἐγγυῆσαι τὴν ἀδελφὴν τὴν ἐαυτοῦ γυναῖκα εἶναι κατὰ τοὺς νόμους *ib.* 4, πρὸς δὲ τοῦτοις ἐκεῖνο αὐτοὺς ἔρεσθε, εἴ τις τῶν γνησίων τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐπιδικάζεσθαι ἀξιοῖ *ib.* 67, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ τοῦτον μὲν ποιήσασθαι τὴν δὲ μὴ εἰσαγαγεῖν τὴν μὲν νόθην, ὥσπερ αὐτῷ προσῆκε, καὶ ἀκληρον κατέστησε, τὸν δὲ κληρονόμον κατέλιπε τῶν ἐαυτοῦ *ib.* 75.

rhythm of the clause did not bring together what seems to be widely separated.¹

But in reading Pindar and the choral odes of tragedy, we are at a great disadvantage, since two elements of the song — the music and the dance — have been lost. Doubtless the dance had its poetical effect, as well as its share in the pageantry. But while in the choral odes we lose the effect of the chorus, in the Homeric poems we have lost no voices of a chorus nor marked and important melody, while the words have preserved for us the distinct rhythm. In the early epic times, indeed, the poems were sung or chanted to a musical accompaniment, but by a single voice, to a thin-toned cithara, with no marked melody. We can 'render' the Homeric poems full as well as the orations of Demosthenes. In epic poetry, the 'written accent' (as we call it) was disregarded by the poet in the composition of his verse, and thus we may reasonably think it of slight moment in the recitation of the poems. But the force of this 'written accent' and its effect in the orator's day cannot be even remotely reproduced by the ordinary scholar. That Demosthenes watched and marked the rhythm of quantity, no one can doubt. That he marked the word-accent is just as certain. Who of to-day can give this combination, with the two elements in due proportion?

The scientific study of the Homeric verse does not date from before the present century. While Bentley treated scientifically the metres of Terence and explained many anomalies in Homer's verse by his restoration of the dropped *vau*, and Porson made subtle observations on the laws of the iambic trimeter, Gottfried Hermann (in his edition of the *Orphica*, 1805) was the first to show the development of the dactylic hexameter, and the characteristics of different poets and periods. Enough remained to be done. Many simple observations were not yet made, and much good truth did not get into the

¹ Blass brings forward as illustrations Dem. v. 18 διὰ τὴν πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ἡμῶν ἐπικηρυκείαν ἐχθρῶς σχήσουσι, where for the reader the construction is obscured by the separation of ἡμῶν from σχήσουσι, but where for the hearer, the rhythm (with a slight pause after ἡμῶν) brought the pronoun into its proper relation with the participle; and Dem. xxiii. 69 τῷ δ' ἐπιδεῖν διδόντα δίκην ἔξεστιν, ἦν ἔταξ' ὁ νόμος, τὸν ἀλόντα, πέρα δ' οὐδὲν τούτου, where, according to the view of Blass, a division into three clauses (ending 'with δίκην, νόμος, τούτου, respectively) formed the necessary connexion.

ordinary text-books for long years. Few school-boys or college students a quarter of a century ago were taught the two great tangible differences between Vergil's verse and that of the Homeric poems,—the predominance of the feminine caesura and of dactyls in Homer, and of the masculine caesura and of spondees in Vergil. The larger number of spondees in Vergil, and the heavier swing of the Roman verse, seems obvious, but the ordinary school-boy believes that Vergil's verse is like that of Homer in every particular. As late as 1885, the treatise on Greek metres by Gleditsch, in Iwan Müller's admirable *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, stated 'die Caesur nach der Thesis des dritten Fusses, τομή πενθημιμερής, ist die beliebteste und häufigste Teilung des Hexameters. . . . Die Penthemimeres ist zu allen Zeiten besonders bevorzugt worden, ausser bei Nonnos und seinen Nachfolgern.' In the second edition of 1889, in the paragraph which treats of the feminine caesura, the statement is inserted, 'bei Homer ist diese Caesur so gebräuchlich dass sie die Penthemimeres noch überwiegt,' but the following paragraph retains the sentence, 'die Caesur nach der Thesis' etc. Thus even the most elementary facts with regard to the heroic hexameter have long escaped observation or general recognition. The subtler difference of arrangement of spondees and dactyls seems to have been almost entirely neglected by scholars. Just as the historic interpretation of the Homeric poems was hindered by the assumption therein of Attic meanings and constructions, so the appreciation of the subtler characteristics of the Homeric verse has been delayed by the belief that this verse did not differ from that of Vergil. The Roman poet doubtless strove in the main to follow in the metrical footsteps of his pattern, but he had stubborn material to deal with; the Latin words did not settle themselves readily in the Greek measure, and their order could not be so simple; the caesura became a mechanical, stencil-plate pause, without special poetic effect,—a pause in the *sound* merely, not in the sense,—like the caesura in the Sapphic verse of Horace as compared with those in the stanzas of the Lesbian herself.

Some scholars have been inclined to think of the caesura in Greek verse as musical rather than rhetorical or poetical,—without appreciable effect upon the expression of the thought,—while the grammatical construction of one verse has been supposed to be connected

with that of the preceding or following as freely as in Vergil or Milton. The caesura of which this paper treats, however, is a veritable pause in thought,—in some cases a musical *rest*, and in others a musical *hold*—a pause affecting the sense directly; and a distinct pause in the sense at the close of the verse is also here claimed to be Homeric. The relation of these two pauses to the expression of thought in Homer has been too much neglected; scholars have not recognized with sufficient distinctness the aid to interpretation which lies in them.

THE PAUSE AT THE CLOSE OF THE VERSE IN HOMER.

In general, all must feel that ‘the thought of each Homeric verse is somewhat more independent than is the case with later poetry,’ and that ‘other things being equal, a word should be construed with words in the same rather than in another verse.’¹ ‘The metrical unit coincides with the grammatical and rhetorical unit.’ Take for example,

A ἰ μῆνιν αἶδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος
οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρὶ ἼΑχαιοῖς ἄλγε’ ἔθηκεν,
πολλὰς δ’ ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἰαίδι προΐαψεν
ἡρώων, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν
5 οἰωνοῖσί τε δαῖτα, Διὸς δ’ ἐτελείετο βουλή,
ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε
Ἀτρεΐδης τε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν καὶ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς.
τίς τ’ ἄρ σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι;

Here the thought of the first verse is complete in itself; the sentence might have ended with the verse. But the thought of the *μῆνις* suggests its results, and *οὐλομένην* is added as an appositive to *μῆνιν* and an introduction to the rest of the verse,—it is not forced by considerations of ‘metrical convenience’ from a place in the first verse. The ‘wrath’ was ‘mortal’ inasmuch as it caused the Achaeans many woes. Doubtless Milton had this passage and adjective in mind when he wrote

‘whose mortal taste
Brought Death into the world and all our woe,’

¹ Seymour’s *Homeric Language and Verse*, § 1 g. See *Lehrs de Aristarchi Studiis Homericis*,³ 446 ff.

but his adjective is unemphatic because of its position, while Homer's adjective is made prominent not simply by its place at the beginning of the line, and its wide separation from the noun with which it agrees, but still more so by its relation to the following clause. Homer's sentence clearly might end too with the second verse, of which the thought is repeated in more definite form by the following verses ; or it might end at the close of the third verse. *ἥρώων* 4 is used without special emphasis ; of course it does not mean 'heroes' as contrasted with ordinary men ; it signifies simply 'warriors' or 'brave warriors,' and is used to form a sort of contrast with the following *αὐτούς*. Thus, also, it is clear that the sentence might close with any of verses 4, 5, and 6. The seventh verse may fairly be taken as in apposition with the subject of *διαστήτην*, rather than the subject itself ; but this point shall not be pressed at present.

In the following passage, also, each succeeding verse is clearly added as a sort of afterthought.

ξ 180 " σοὶ δὲ θεοὶ τόσα δοῖεν, ὅσα φρεσὶ σῇσι μενοινᾶς,
 ἄνδρα τε καὶ οἶκον, καὶ ὁμοφροσύνην ὀπάσειαν
 ἔσθλῃν· οὐ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ γε κρεῖσσον καὶ ἄρειον,
 ἢ ὅθ' ὁμοφρονέοντε νοήμασιν οἶκον ἔχῃτον
 ἀνὴρ ἡδὲ γυνή· πᾶλλ' ἄλγεα δυσμενέεσσιν,
 χάρματα δ' εὐμενέτῃσι, μάλιστα δέ τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοί."

As another illustration of the principle under discussion, consider

Ζ 254 " τέκνον, τίπτε λιπὼν πόλεμον θρασὺν εἰλήλουθας ;
 ἦ μάλα δὴ τείρονσι δυσώνυμοι νῖες Ἀχαιῶν
 μαρνάμενοι περὶ ἄστυ, σὲ δ' ἐνθάδε θυμὸς ἀνῆκεν
 ἐλθόντ' ἐξ ἄκρης πόλιος Διὶ χεῖρας ἀνασχεῖν.
 ἀλλὰ μὲν, ὅφρα κέ τοι μελιηδέα οἶνον ἐνείκω,
 ὥς σπείσῃς Διὶ πατρὶ καὶ ἄλλοις ἀθανάτοισιν
 260 πρῶτον, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τὸς ὀνήσῃαι, αἶ κε πύγῃσθα.
 ἀνδρὶ δὲ κεκμηῶτι μένος μέγα οἶνος ἀέξει,
 ὥς τὴν κέκμηκας ἀμύνων σοῖσιν ἔτησιν."

In this passage a full stop could be placed at the close of any verse without troubling the sense or grammatical construction up to that point. The only opportunity for difference of opinion is in verse 256 ; is *ἐνθάδε* to be construed directly with *ἀνῆκεν*, or with *ἐλθόντα*

of the following verse? After an examination of many such passages, I have no hesitation in expressing my opinion that the former construction is to be preferred. 'Thy soul urged thee hither, — to come and pray to Zeus.' In 260, *πρῶτον* is added to the thought of 259 simply as an afterthought (like *ἡρώων* A 4; see p. 96), in order to form a contrast with what follows. Verse 262 is added clearly only as an explanation of 261, as is indicated by *κεκμηῶτι* and *κέκμηκας*, which are in exactly the same position in the verse. Compare also

- X 38 "Ἐκτορ, μή μοι μίμνε, φίλον τέκος, ἀνέρα τοῦτον
οἶος ἀνευθ' ἄλλων, ἵνα μὴ τάχα πότμον ἐπίσπῃς
40 Πηλείωνι δαμείς, ἐπεὶ ἡ πολὺ φέρτερός ἐστιν,
σχέτλιος· αἶθε θεοῖσι φίλος τόσσονδε γένοιτο,
ῥοσσον ἐμοί· τάχα κέν ἐ κύνες καὶ γῦπες ἔδοιεν
κείμενον· ἥ κέ μοι αἰνὸν ἀπὸ πρᾶπιδων ἄχος ἔλθοι·
ὃς μ' υἱὼν πολλῶν τε καὶ ἐσθλῶν εὖνιν ἔθηκεν,
45 κτείνων καὶ περνᾷς ἐπὶ νήσων τηλεδαπάων."

Here, again, the punctuation cannot be taken as the test of a pause. Only at the close of verse 41, could the reader doubt the possibility of a full stop. I would not press this, for I am far from asserting that the sense is always complete at the end of a line in Homer, but I would call attention to the fact that the idea of *ῥοσσον ἐμοί* is in a measure already contained in *σχέτλιος*. This adjective *σχέτλιος* cannot be referred (with Monro) to Hector. Its position can be explained only by its reference to Achilles and its connexion with what follows. 'Horrible man that he is! Would that the *gods* so hated him!' (*θεοῖσι* is emphatic before the caesura.) This interpretation is applicable to the parallel passage in Hecabe's address to Hector,

- X 85 "μηδὲ πρόμος ἴστασο τούτῳ·
σχέτλιος· εἴ περ γάρ σε κατακτάνῃ, οὐ σ' ἔτ' ἐγὼ γε
κλαύσομαι ἐν λεχέεσσι, φίλον θάλος, ὃν τέκον αὐτή,
οὐδ' ἄλοχος πολυῶρος· ἀνευθε δέ σε μέγα νῶιν
'Ἀργείων παρὰ νηυσὶ κύνες ταχέες κατέδονται."

Here the thought is: 'Stand not forth on the field of battle to meet Achilles. Horrible man that he is! If he slay thee, he will throw thy body to the dogs.' Achilles deserves the epithet *σχέτλιος*, in

Hecabe's eyes, because he is pitiless and will not accept a ransom for Hector's body. The ordinary reader would fail to appreciate the situation from a literal translation of the passage without regard to the arrangement of the words.

APPOSITIVES ADDED AS BONDS OF CONNEXION.

In general when an adjective (or its equivalent, a limiting genitive) or substantive at the beginning of a verse agrees with (or limits) a word in the preceding line, it is added as a kind of appositive in order to introduce the following clause, either directly, as in

κ 348 ἀμφίπολοι δ' ἄρα τέως μὲν ἐνὶ μεγάροισι πένοντο
τέσσαρες, αἳ οἱ δῶμα κάτα δρήστειραι ἕασιν,

or by way of contrast, as in

κ 354 ἡ δ' ἐτέρη προπάροιθε θρόνων ἐτίταινε τραπέζας
ἀργυρέας, ἐπὶ δέ σφι τίθει χρύσεια κάνεα.

Some apparent exceptions to this remark are only superficial. A noted case is

M 51 (ἔπποι) μάλα δὲ χρεμέτιζον ἐπ' ἄκρῳ
χείλει ἐφεσταότες,

but even here ἐπ' ἄκρῳ is to be construed directly as an adverbial phrase with χρεμέτιζον, and χείλει as dative of place with ἐφεσταότες.

The following passage well exemplifies the Homeric characteristic in question, and at the same time is itself elucidated by a full application of the principle :

α 48 “ἀλλὰ μοι ἀμφ' Ὀδυσῆι δαΐφρονι δαίεται ἦτορ,
δυσμῶρψ, ὅς δὴ δηθὰ φίλων ἄπο πήματα πάσχει
50 νήσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ, ὅθι τ' ὀμφαλὸς ἔστι θαλάσσης,
νήσος δεινδρήεσσα, θεὰ δ' ἐν δώματα ναίει,
Ἄτλαντος θυγάτηρ ὀλοόφρονος, ὅς τε θαλάσσης
πάσσης βένθεα οἶδεν, ἔχει δέ τε κίονας αὐτὸς
μακράς, αἱ γαῖάν τε καὶ οὐρανὸν ἀμφὶς ἔχουσιν.”

δυσμῶρψ 49 is added in apposition with Ὀδυσῆι, in order to introduce the rest of the verse, just as οὐλομένην A 2 is an appositive to μῆνιν A 1 and is explained by the following ἡ μυρὶ Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε'

ἔθηκεν. Similarly μακράς 54 introduces the rest of the verse; the columns which perform such service deserve this epithet. Ἄτλαντος θυγάτηρ 52 is in apposition with θεά, and νῆσος δεινδρήεσσα 51 is a repetition of νήσῳ just above. To place a period at the close of 50, with Nauck and Hentze, is unreasonable in view not only of the Homeric method of forming a connexion between consecutive verses, but also of the frequent examples of attraction to the construction of a nearer relative clause, as in

α 22 ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Αἰθίοπας μετεκίαθε τηλόθ' ἑόντας,
Αἰθίοπας τοὶ διχθὰ δεδαίεται, ἔσχατοι ἀνδρῶν,

where ἔσχατοι is attracted to the case of the relative τοί, and

α 69 Κύκλωπος κεχόλωται, ὃν ὀφθαλμοῦ ἀλάσεν,
ἀντίθεον Πολύφημον,

where Πολύφημον is attracted from the genitive to the case of the preceding relative, ὃν.

To note here a characteristic which will receive fuller illustration in the latter part of this paper, I may observe that ὀλοόφρονος 52 is added after the verse-pause, in apposition with Ἄτλαντος and introducing the following relative clause, exactly as δυσμῶρφ 49 and μακράς 54 are used; the phrase ὅς τε θαλάσσης κτλ. marks Atlas as a sea divinity (*cf.* δ 385 Πρωτεύς, ὅς τε κτλ., Ποσειδάωνος ὑποδμῶς), and the sea was proverbially many-faced, deceitful, and destructive.

Compare also the following passages :

- E 125 ἐν γάρ τοι στήθεσσι μένος πατρώιον ἦκα
ἄτρομον, οἷον ἔχεσκε σακέσπαλος ἱππότηα Τυδεύς.
E 63 (νῆας) ἀρχεκάκους, αἱ πᾶσι κακὸν Τρώεσσι γέγοντο.
E 51 ἐσθλὸν θηρητῆρα· δίδαξε γὰρ Ἄρτεμις αὐτῇ
βάλλειν ἄγρια πάντα, τὰ τε τρέφει οὐρέσιν ὕλη.
E 312 εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὀξὺ νόησε Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη,
μήτηρ, ἣ μιν ὑπ' Ἀγχίσῃ τέκε βουκολέοντι.
E 339 ῥέε δ' ἄμβροτον αἶμα θεοῖο,
ἰχώρ, οἷός περ τε ῥέει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν.
E 361 λίην ἄχθομαι ἔλκος, ὃ με βροτὸς οὐτάσεν ἀνὴρ
Τυδείδης, ὃς νῦν γε καὶ ἂν Διὶ πατρὶ μάχοιτο.
E 377 ἐγὼ φίλον υἱὸν ὑπεξέφερον πολέμοιο
Αἰνείαν, ὃς ἐμοὶ πάντων πολὺ φίλτατόν ἐστιν.

- E 405 σοὶ δ' ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἀνῆκε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη·
 νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ οἶδε κατὰ φρένα Τυδεΐος υἱός,
 ὅττι μάλ' οὐ δηναιός, ὃς ἀθανάτοισι μάχεται.
 E 544 ἀφνειὸς βιότοιο, γένος δ' ἦν ἐκ ποταμοῖο
 Ἀλφειοῦ, ὃς τ' εὐρὺν ῥέει Πυλίων διὰ γαίης.

Here Ἀλφειοῦ is certainly in apposition with ποταμοῖο, and we have not the mere equivalent of the prosaic τοῦ ποταμοῦ Ἀλφειοῦ.

- E 319 οὐδ' υἱὸς Καπανῆος ἐλήθετο συνθεσιῶν
 τᾶων, ᾧς ἐπέτελλε βοῖν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης.
 E 738 ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὅμοισιν βάλετ' αἰγίδα θυσανόεσσαν
 δεινὴν, ἣν πέρι μὲν πάντῃ φόβος ἔστεφάνωται.
 E 745 ἐς δ' ὄχρα φλόγεα ποσὶ βήσεται, λάζετο δ' ἔγχος
 βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν, τῷ δάμνησι σίχχας ἀνδρῶν
 ἡρώων, τοῖσιν τε κοτέσσεται ὀβριμοπάτρη,

'and seized her spear — (the spear) heavy, great, and strong, with which she breaks the ranks of men, — of the brave warriors at whom she, the daughter of a mighty father, conceives anger.'

- E 862 τοὺς δ' ἄρ' ὑπὸ τρόμος εἶλεν Ἀχαιοὺς τε Τρῳάς τε
 δέσαντας· τόσον ἔβραχ' Ἄρης ἄτος πολέμοιο.
 E 875 σοὶ πάντες μαχόμεσθα· σὺ γὰρ τέκες ἄφρονα κούρην,
 οὐλομένην, ἣ τ' αἰὲν ἀήσυλα ἔργα μεμήλιν.
 E 892 μητρός τοι μένος ἔστιν ἀάσχετον, οὐκ ἐπιεικτόν,
 Ἥρης· τὴν μὲν ἐγὼ σπουδῇ δάμνημι ἔπεσιν.
 Z 136 δύσεθ' ἄλως κατὰ κύμα, Θέτις δ' ὑποδέξατο κόλπῳ
 δεδιότα· κρατερὸς γὰρ ἔχε τρόμος ἀνδρὸς ὁμοκλή.
 Z 289 ἐνθ' ἔσαν οἱ πέπλοι παμποίκιλοι, ἔργα γυναικῶν
 Σιδονίων, τὰς αὐτὸς Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδὴς
 ἤγαγε Σιδονίηθεν.

In 290, Welcker, Nauck, and Madvig have proposed to read τοὺς (referring to πέπλοι) for τὰς, but the change is directly opposed to Homeric usage, as is set forth in these examples. The position of Σιδονίων is inexplicable unless it forms the connecting link between what has preceded and the rest of its verse. It cannot be an attributive adjective with γυναικῶν. In 289, the reading παμποίκιλα is recommended not only as required by the initial *vau* of *φέργα*, but also by the fact that its position after πέπλοι, and separated from it

by the caesura, is unusual unless the adjective follows as an appositive and in close connexion with the next clause. (See p. 116.)

- Z 392 εὔτε πύλας ἵκανε διερχόμενος μέγα ἄστυ,
Σκαιάς, τῇ ἄρ' ἐμελλε διεξιμέναι πεδίοις.
Z 497 αἶψα δ' ἔπειθ' ἵκανε δόμους ἐν ναιετάοντας
Ἑκτορος ἀνδροφόνου, κινήσατο δ' ἔνδοθι πολλὰς
ἀμφιπόλους, τῇσιν δὲ γόνυ πᾶσῃσιν ἐνῶρσεν.

In 499, ἀμφιπόλους is in apposition with πολλὰς, while Ἑκτορος 498 does not limit δόμους directly but is also in apposition. 'She came to the house, the house of Hector, and found within many women, maidservants,' etc.

- Z 158 ὃς ῥ' ἐκ δήμου ἔλασεν, ἐπεὶ πολὺ φέρτερος ἦεν,
'Αργείων· Ζεὺς γάρ οἱ ὑπὸ σκίπτρῳ ἐδάμασεν.

In 159, commentators have been uncertain whether δήμον 'Αργείων or Βελλεροφόντην was to be supplied in thought as the object of ἐδάμασεν, but the analogy of the other passages requires that the object be supplied from the first word of the verse. Otherwise 'Αργείων is out of position. But if 'Αργείων is rather an appositive to δήμου than a limiting genitive 'with it, then 'Αργείους is to be supplied, rather than δήμον 'Αργείων, as the object of ἐδάμασεν.

- Λ 558 ὥς δ' ὅτ' ὄνος παρ' ἄρουραν ἰὼν ἐβλήσατο παῖδας
νωθῆς, ᾧ δὴ πολλὰ περὶ ῥόπαλ' ἀμφὶς ἐάγη.

Slightly different is

- M 234 ἐξ ἄρα δὴ τοι ἔπειτα θεοὶ φρένας ὤλεσαν αὐτοί,
ὃς κέλει Ζηνὸς μὲν ἐριγδούποιο λαθέσθαι
βουλῶν, ἃς τέ μοι αὐτὸς ὑπέσχετο καὶ κατένευσε,

where Ζηνός should be construed with λαθέσθαι, while it is explained by the following verse; — it is not the prosaic 'to forget the counsels of Zeus.'

- Σ 20 κεῖται Πάτροκλος, νέκυος δὲ δὴ ἀμφιμάχονται
γυμνοῦ· ἀτὰρ τά γε τεύχε' ἔχει κορυθαίολος Ἑκτωρ.
Σ 199 αἶ κέ σ' ὑποδείσαντες ἀπόσχονται πολέμοιο
Τρῶες, ἀναπνεύσωσι δ' ἀρήιοι νῆες Ἀχαιῶν
τειρόμενοι· ὀλίγη δὲ τ' ἀνάπνευστις πολέμοιο.

Τρῶες 200 forms a contrast to νῆες Ἀχαιῶν, and τευρόμενοι 201 suggests similarly ἀνάπνευσις.

- Σ 225 ἥνίοχοι δ' ἔκπληγεν, ἐπεὶ ἶδον ἀκάματον πῦρ
 δεινὸν ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς μεγαθύμου Πηλεΐωνος
 δαιόμενον· τὸ δὲ δαΐε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη.
 Σ 310 ὥς ἔκτωρ ἀγόρευ', ἐπὶ δὲ Τρῶες κελάδησαν
 νήπιοι· ἐκ γὰρ σφέων φρένας εἴλετο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη.
 Σ 516 οἱ δ' ἴσαν· ἦρχε δ' ἄρα σφιν Ἄρης καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη,
 ἄμφω χρυσεῖω, χρύσεια δὲ εἵματα ἔσθην,
 καλῶ καὶ μεγάλῳ, σὺν τεύχεσιν, ὥς τε θεῷ περ,
 ἄμφις ἀριζήλῳ· λαοὶ δ' ὑπ' ὀλίζονες ἦσαν.
 Τ 357 ὥς δ' ὅτε ταρφειαὶ νιφάδες Διὸς ἐκποτέονται
 ψυχραὶ, ὑπὸ ῥιπῆς αἰθρηγενέος Βορέας.
 Υ 316 μῆδ' ὅπότ' ἂν Τροίῃ μαλερῷ πυρὶ πᾶσα δάηται
 δαιομένη, δαίωσι δ' ἀρήιοι νῆες Ἀχαιῶν.

The desire to secure such a connexion as we have been considering is the basis of the so-called 'epanalepsis.' *E.g.*

- Υ 371 τῷ δ' ἐγὼ ἀντίος εἰμι, καὶ εἰ πυρὶ χεῖρας ἔοικεν,
 εἰ πυρὶ χεῖρας ἔοικε, μένος δ' αἰθῶνι σιδήρῳ.
 Β 849 τηλόθεν ἐξ Ἀμυδῶνος, ἀπ' Ἀξιοῦ εὐρὺ ρέοντος,
 Ἀξιοῦ, οὗ κάλλιστον ὕδωρ ἐπικίδνεται αἶαν.
 Β 870 τῶν μὲν ἄρ' Ἀμφίμαχος καὶ Νάστης ἠγῆσάσθην,
 Νάστης Ἀμφίμαχός τε, Νομίωνος ἀγλαὰ τέκνα.
 Ζ 153 ἔνθα δὲ Σίσυφος ἔσκεν, ὃ κέρδιστος γένετ' ἀνδρῶν,
 Σίσυφος Αἰολίδης· ὃ δ' ἄρα Γλαῦκον τέκεθ' υἱόν.
 Ζ 395 Ἀνδρομάχῃ, θυγάτηρ μεγαλήτορος Ἡετίωνος,
 Ἡετίων, ὃς ἔναϊεν ὑπὸ Πιλάκῳ ὑληέσση.
 Φ 85 γείνατο Λαοθόῃ, θυγάτηρ Ἄλταο γέροντος,
 Ἄλτω, ὃς Λελέγεσσι φιλοπολέμοισιν ἀνάσσει.
 Ψ 641 οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἔσαν δίδυμοι· ὃ μὲν ἔμπεδον ἥνιόχευεν,
 ἔμπεδον ἥνιόχευ', ὃ δ' ἄρα μᾶστιγι κέλευεν.

In X 331 "Ἐκτορ, ἀτάρ που ἔφης Ἀπαροκλήῃ ἐξεναρῖζων
 σῶς ἔσσεσθ', ἐμὲ δ' οὐδὲν ὀπίζω νοσφιν ἔοντα.
 νήπιε! τοῖο δ' ἀνευθεν ἀοσητήρ μέγ' ἀμείνων
 νηυσὶν ἐπὶ γλαφυρῇσιν ἔγῳ μετόπισθε λελείμην,"

Bekker (1843) placed a comma at the close of 332, and a period after νήπιε 333, and has been followed by later editors. But, when this is compared with similar passages, νήπιε is seen to be construed with what follows.

X 418 λίσσωμι' ἀνέρα τοῦτον Ἀτάσθαλον ὀβριμοεργόν,
 ἣν πως ἡλικίην αἰδέσσεται ἥδ' ἐλεήσει
 γῆρας. καὶ δέ νυ τῷ γε πατὴρ τοιόσδε τέτυκται.
 Πηλεὺς, ὅς μιν ἔτικτε, καὶ ἔτρεφε πῆμα γενέσθαι
 Τρωσί· μάλιστα δ' ἐμοὶ περὶ πάντων ἄλγε' ἔθηκεν.

A recent edition translates ἡλικίην αἰδέσσεται by 'have shame before his equals,' saying that 'if ἡλικίην mean *my age*, then 420 is purely tautological.' I believe, however, that the thought may be considered complete at the close of each of these verses, and that 419 means 'if haply he may reverence my age and pity it.' Then ἡλικίην suggested γῆρας κτλ., 'my *old* age, — the age of his own father.' Then πατήρ suggested Πηλεὺς, which is modified in the rest of 421. Τρωσί 422 is introduced chiefly in order to form a full contrast with ἐμοί.

Ω 290 ἄλλ' εὐχεν σύ γ' ἔπειτα κελαινεφεί Κρονίων
 Ἰδαίῳ, ὅς τε Τροίην κατὰ πᾶσαν ὄραται.
 Ω 453 θύρην δ' ἔχε μῶνος ἐπιβλήs
 ἐλάτινος, τὸν τρεῖς μὲν ἐπιρρήσεσκον Ἀχαιοί,
 τρεῖς δ' ἀναοίγεσκον μεγάλην κληῖδα θυράων,
 τῶν ἄλλων· Ἀχιεὺς δ' ἄρ' ἐπιρρήσεσκε καὶ αὐτός.
 Ω 468 ὧς ἄρα φωνήσας ἀπέβη πρὸς μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον
 Ἑρμείας· Πριάμος δ' ἐξ ἵππων ἄλτο χαμᾶζε.

Ἑρμείας 469 is not itself the subject of ἀπέβη (which is supplied easily from what has preceded), but is in apposition with that subject, and is added in order to form a marked contrast to Πριάμος.

Ω 478 χερσὶν Ἀχιλλῆος λάβε γούνατα καὶ κύσε χεῖρας
 δεινὰs ἀνδροφόνους, αἱ οἱ πολέας κτάνον νῆας.
 Ω 614 νῦν δέ που ἐν πέτρῃσιν, ἐν οὖρεσιν οἰοπόλοισιν,
 ἐν Σιπύλῳ, ὅθι φασὶ θεῶν ἔμμεναι ἐνὶ
 νυμφάων, αἷ τ' ἀμφ' Ἀχελώϊον ἐρρώσαντο.

νυμφάων 616 is doubtless in apposition with θεῶν.

α 17 τῷ οἱ ἐπεκλώσαντο θεοὶ οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι
 εἰς Ἰθάκην, οὐδ' ἔνθα πεφνυγμένος ἦεν ἀέθλων
 καὶ μετὰ οἷσι φίλοισι.

In this passage, εἰς Ἰθάκην is an appositive to οἰκόνδε, and καὶ μετὰ οἷσι φίλοισι τοῖς ἐνθα.

α 150 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο
 μνηστήρες τοῖσιν μὲν ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἄλλα μεμῆλιν.

The ordinary punctuation of this passage is a comma after *μνηστήρες* and none after *ἔντο*. But *μνηστήρες* cannot be the subject of the preceding verb, according to Homeric usage. Nitzsch conjectures *μνηστήρσιν τοῖσιν μὲν*, and Ameis-Hentze places the comma after *ἔντο*, supposing that the 'logical subject of the apodosis to 150 is at once taken up in an altered construction by *τοῖσιν μὲν*.' The truth seems to be that *μνηστήρες* is added as an appositive to the subject of *ἔντο*, and is in close connexion with the following clause. See the examples in which the article is expressed at the beginning of the verse in order to introduce the next clause. (P. 108.) *τοῖσιν μὲν* is contrasted of course with *αὐτὰρ Τηλέμαχος* 156.

α 128 *δουροδόκης ἔντοσθεν ἐυξόου, ἔνθα περ ἄλλα
ἔγχε' Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος ἵστατο πολλὰ.*

In this passage some might be tempted to see only the ordinary Greek idiom of *ἄλλος* (*cf.* οἱ πολῖται καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ξένοι), if it were not for other examples like the one immediately following, where *ἄλλος* is followed by an appositive.

α 132 *παρ' ὃ αὐτὸς κλισμὸν θέτο ποικίλον ἔκτοσθεν ἄλλων
μνηστήρων, μὴ ξείνος . . . δεῖπνῳ ἀδήσειεν.*
α 159 *τούτοισιν μὲν ταῦτα μέλει, κίθαρις καὶ αἰοιδή,
ρεῖ', ἐπεὶ ἀλλότριον βίοντι νήποινον ἔδουσιν,
ἀνέρος, οὐ δὴ πού λεύκ' ὁστέα πύθεται ὄμβρῳ
κέϊμεν' ἐπ' ἠπείρου, ἣ εἰν ἀλὶ κῦμα κυλίνδει.*

Clearly *ρεῖα* 160 modifies *μέλει*, but is introduced as an afterthought in order to prepare the way for the rest of the verse; while *ἀνέρος* is in apposition with the *ἄλλου* which is implied in *ἀλλότριον*. Both thought and grammatical construction are complete at the close of each of these verses.

α 197 *ἀλλ' ἔτι πού ζωὸς κατερύκεται εὐρέϊ πόντῳ
νήσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ, χαλεποὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες ἔχουσιν
ἄγριοι, οἳ πού κείνον ἐρυκανόωσ' ἀέκοντα.*

Here *νήσῳ κτλ.* is added to explain the close of 197, while *ἄγριοι* forms the connexion with the rest of its verse, which explains it.

α 210 *πρὶν γε τὸν ἐς Τροίην ἀναβήμεναι, ἔνθα περ ἄλλοι
Ἀργείων οἱ ἄριστοι ἔβαν κοίλῃς ἐνὶ νηυσίν.*
α 217 *ὥς δὴ ἐγὼ γ' ὄφελον μάκαρός νύ τευ ἔμμεναι υἱὸς
ἀνέρος, ὃν κτεάτεσσιν ἐοῖς ἐπὶ γῆρας ἔτετμεν.*

Only a veritable beginner would construe *μάκαρος* directly with *άνέρος*, and fail to see that the latter is added simply in order to form a close connexion with the following clause.

In α 326 ὁ δ' Ἀχαιῶν νόστον ἄειδεν
 λυγρόν, ὃν ἐκ Τροίης ἐπετείλατο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη,

the pause after *Τροίης* separates that from the following verb and connects it with the relative pronoun. Here, too, the adjective *λυγρόν* has a different effect from what it could have in the preceding verse. 'He was singing of the return of the Achaeans,—the sad return from Troy which Athena imposed upon them.' With this is to be compared

α 340 ταύτης δ' ἀποπαύε' ἀοιδῆς
 λυγρῆς, ἣ τέ μοι αἰὲν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλον κῆρ,

where clearly the adjective *λυγρῆς* is explained by the following clause.

α 370 τόδε καλὸν ἀκουέμεν ἐστὶν ἀοιδοῦ
 τοιοῦδ' οἷος ὃδ' ἐστὶ, θεοῖς ἐναλίγκιος αὐδῆν.

Here *ἀκουέμεν* κτλ. is in apposition with *τόδε*, while the whole verse 371 is added in explanation of *ἀοιδοῦ*, and the second half-verse of 371 is explanatory of *τοιοῦδε*.

α 441 βῆ ῥ' ἵμεν ἐκ θαλάμοιο, θύρην δ' ἐπέρυσσε κορώνη
 ἀργυρῆ, ἐπὶ δὲ κληῖδ' ἐτάνυσσεν ἵμαντι.

β 21 τρεῖς δέ οἱ ἄλλοι ἔσαν, καὶ ὁ μὲν μνηστήρσιν ὁμίλειν,
 Εὐρύνομος, δύο δ' αἰὲν ἔχον πατρώα ἔργα.

β 65 ἄλλους δ' αἰδεσθῆτε περικτίονας ἀνθρώπους,
 οἱ περιναιετάουσι· θεῶν δ' ὑποδείσατε μῆνιν.

β 165 ἐγγὺς ἔων τοῖσδεσσι φόνον καὶ κῆρα φυτεύει
 πάντεσσιν· πολέσιν δὲ καὶ ἄλλοισιν κακὸν ἔσται.

β 281 τῷ νῦν μνηστήρων μὲν ἔα βουλὴν τε νόον τε
 ἀφραδέων, ἐπεὶ οὐ τι νοήμονες οὐδὲ δίκαιοι.

β 405 ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας· ἡγήσατο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη
 καρπαλίμως· ὁ δ' ἔπειτα μετ' ἔχγνα βαῖνε θεοῖο.

γ 75 τὸν δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίον ἦδα
 θαρσύνσας· αὐτὴ γὰρ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θάρσος Ἀθήνη | θῆκε.

γ 93 κείνου λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον ἐνισπεῖν, εἴ που ὄππας
 ὀφθαλμοῖσι τεοῖσιν ἢ ἄλλου μῦθον ἄκουσας.

In this passage, ἐσθλήν is added in order to introduce the rest of the verse, and ἀνὴρ ἡδὲ γυνή is in apposition with the subject of ἔχγον.

η 64 τὸν μὲν ἄκουρον ἔοντα βάλ' ἀργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων
νύμφιον, ἐν μεγάρῳ μίαν οἶην παῖδα λιπόντα
'Αρήτην· τὴν δ' Ἀλκίνοος ποιήσατ' ἄκοιτιν.

θ 100 νῦν δ' ἐξέλθωμεν καὶ ἀέθλων πειρηθῶμεν
πάντων, ὥς χ' ὁ ξείνος ἐνίσπη οἷσι φίλοιςιν
οἴκαδε νοστήσας, ὅσσον περιγιγνόμεθ' ἄλλων
πῦξ τε παλαιμοσύνη τε καὶ ἄλμασιν ἡδὲ πόδεσσιν.

Here too the thought is fairly complete at the close of each verse.

ι 270 Ζεὺς δ' ἐπιτιμῆτωρ ἱκετῶν τε ξείνων τε
ξείνιος, ὃς ξείνοισιν ἄμ' αἰδοίοισιν ὀπηδεῖ.

κ 38 ὦ πόποι, ὥς ὅδε πᾶσι φίλος καὶ τίμιός ἐστιν
ἀνθρώποις, ὅτεών τε πόλιν καὶ γαῖαν ἱκνῆται.

κ 159 ὁ μὲν ποταμόνδε κατῆεν ἐκ νομοῦ ὕλης
πιόμενος· διὴ γάρ μιν ἔχεν μένος ἡελίοιο.

κ 208 βῆ δ' ἰέναι, ἅμα τῷ γε δύω καὶ εἴκοσ' ἐταῖροι
κλαίοντες· κατὰ δ' ἄμμε λίπον γοώοντας ὀπισθεν.

κ 348 ἀμφίπολοι δ' ἄρα τέως μὲν ἐνὶ μεγάροισι πένοντο
τέσσαρες, αἷ οἱ δῶμα κάτα δρήσκειται ἕασιν.

λ 448 πάυς δέ οἱ ἦν ἐπὶ μαζῷ
νήπιος, ὃς που νῦν γε μετ' ἀνδρῶν ἵζει ἀριθμῷ,
ὄλβιος· ἦ γὰρ τόν γε πατὴρ φίλος ὄψεται ἐλθών.

In 449, νήπιος is brought over from the former verse as an introduction to the contrast which follows, while in 450 the exclamation ὄλβιος is explained by the rest of the verse.

μ 21 σχέτλιοι, οἳ ζῶοντες ὑπήλθετε δῶμ' Ἀίδαο,
δισθανέες, ὅτε τ' ἄλλοι ἀπαξ θνήσκουσ' ἀνθρωποι.

μ 62 τῇ μὲν τ' οὐδὲ ποτητὰ παρέρχεται οὐδὲ πέλειαι
τρήρωνες, ταί τ' ἀμβροσίην Διὶ πατρὶ φέρουσιν.

ο 223 σχεδόθεν δέ οἱ ἦλυνθεν ἀνὴρ
τηλεδαπός, φεύγων ἐξ Ἄργεος ἄνδρα κατακτάς,
μάντις· ἀτὰρ γενεὴν γε Μελάμποδος ἔκγονος ἦεν.

φ 11 ἔνθα δὲ τόξον ἔκειτο παλίντονον ἡδὲ φαρέτρη
ιοδόκος, πολλοὶ δ' ἔνεσαν στονόεντες ὀιστοί.

- φ 25 ἐπεὶ δὴ Διὸς υἱὸν ἀφίκετο καρτερόθυμον,
 φῶθ' Ἡρακλῆα, μεγάλων ἐπιύστορα ἔργων,
 ὃς μιν ξεῖνον ἔοντα κατέκτανεν ὧ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ,
 σχέτλιος, οὐδὲ θεῶν ὅπιν ἠδέσατ' οὐδὲ τράπεζαν
 τήν, ἣν οἱ παρέθηκεν· ἔπειτα δὲ πέφνε καὶ αὐτόν.
 ω 83 ὥς κεν τηλεφανῆς ἐκ ποντοφύην ἀνδράσιν εἶη
 τοῖς, οἳ νῦν γεγάασι καὶ οἳ μετόπισθεν ἔσονται.

Homer's habit of closing the thought with the verse creates a strong presumption against the received punctuation in passages like

- X 249 τὸν πρότερος προσέειπε μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἑκτωρ·
 “οὐ σ' ἔτι, Πηλέος υἱέ, φοβήσομαι, ὥς τὸ πάρος περ
 τρίς περὶ ἄστῳ μέγα Πριάμῳ δῖον οὐδέ ποτ' ἔτλην
 μεῖναι ἐπερχόμενον· νῦν αὐτέ με θυμὸς ἀνήκει
 στήμεναι ἀντία σεῖο· ἔλοιμί κεν ἢ κεν ἀλοήην.”

Here a colon should stand at the close of 250, as in the edition of Heyne (Wolf has a period). The following verse follows in a sort of apposition with τὸ πάρος περ. To place a comma after φοβήσομαι and connect ὥς τὸ πάρος περ with δῖον is to neglect the indications of Homeric rhythm.

Similarly Bekker (1858) was right in punctuating

- X 129 βέλτερον αὐτ' ἔριδι ξυνελαυνόμεν ὅττι τάχιστα·
 εἶδομεν ὅπποτέρῳ κεν Ὀλύμπιος εἵχος ὀρέξῃ,

instead of with a period after ξυνελαυνόμεν. Compare

- γ 17 ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἰθὺς κίε Νέστορος ἵπποδάμοιο·
 εἶδομεν ἦν τινα μῆτιν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κέκευθεν.

In passages like

- α 197 ἀλλ' ἔτι πον ζῶς κατερύκεται εὐρέϊ πόντῳ
 νήσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ, χαλεποὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες ἔχουσιν
 ἄγριοι οἳ πον κείνον ἐρυκανόωσ' ἀέκοντα,

commas should be placed at the close of the verse (197, 198), in order to mark the relation of the succeeding verse and to make clear that ἄγριοι (for instance) is not construed exactly like χαλεποί.

In other passages also the punctuation may be revised to advantage in accordance with these principles. For instance,

- X 285 νῦν αὐτ' ἐμὸν ἔγχος ἄλεναί
 χάλκεον· ὥς δὴ μιν σῶ ἐν χροῖ πᾶν κομίσαιο·
 καὶ κεν ἐλαφρότερος Ἀπόλλεμος Τρώεσσι γένοιτο
 σείο καταφθιμένοιο· ἄ σὺ γάρ σφισι πῆμα μέγιστον.

The usual punctuation is given above. Some editors place a full stop instead of a colon, at the close of 286. The Homeric style seems to demand a comma after 286 and another after 287. Verse 287 gives the result of the wish of 286. The first hemistich of 288 simply repeats the condition which is implied two lines above, as Lange said. The suggestion that 288 was an interpolation appears to have been based upon oblivion of Homer's habit of repeating such clauses. The comparative indifference which has been shown toward punctuation since Nicanor's time, is shown in Hecabe's lament

X 431 τέκνον, ἐγὼ δειλὴ· τί νυ βείομαι αἰνὰ παθοῦσα,

which, until Düntzer's edition, had no colon at the caesural pause. What the construction really is, appears from Andromache's corresponding lament

X 477 Ἐκτορ, ἐγὼ δύστηνος· ἱγῆ ἄρα γεινόμεθ' αἶσθ.

In K 252 ἄστρο δὲ δὴ προβέβηκε, παροίχωκεν δὲ πλέων νύξ
τῶν δύο μοιράων, ἄτριτάτη δ' ἔτι μοῖρα λέλειπται,

if 253 is not to be rejected with most authorities, the rhythm of the verse strongly favors the construction of δύο as nominative, in apposition with πλέων νύξ, and of τῶν μοιράων as partitive genitive.

In Λ 653 εὔ δὲ σὺ οἶσθα, γεραῖε διατρεφές, οἶος ἐκείνος
δεινὸς ἀνὴρ· τάχα κεν καὶ ἀναίτιον αἰτιώτο,

Bekker (1858) was right in placing a stop at the close of 653; but Nauck's colon seems better than Bekker's period or Doederlein's comma, to indicate that δεινὸς ἀνὴρ is in apposition with οἶος. Doederlein compares

O 93 οἶσθα καὶ αὐτή,
οἶος ἐκείνου θυμός, ὑπερφιάλος καὶ ἀπηγής,

and Φ 108 οὐχ ὀράας οἶος καὶ ἐγὼ, καλὸς τε μέγας τε,

where the adjectives are generally recognized as in apposition with the relative pronoun.

Scholars must not allow the traditional punctuation to play the despot in their Homeric studies, any more than the traditional division into books. Most details of punctuation have no support in ancient authorities.

HOMERIC RHYTHM USED TO FORM PARENTHESIS.

For the interpretation of the Homeric poems, the student must note that many verses and half-verses are parenthetical, and that the construction may be continued without reference to them. Easy cases are :

E 907 αἱ δ' αὖτις πρὸς δῶμα Διὸς μέγαλοιο νέοντο,
(Ἦρῃ τ' Ἀργείῃ καὶ Ἀλαλκομενῆϊς Ἀθήνῃ,)
παύσασαι βροτολογιὸν Ἄρην ἀνδροκτασιάνων.

Δ 22 ἦ τοι Ἀθηναίη ἀκέων ἦν οὐδέ τι εἶπεν,
(σκυζομένη Διὶ πατρί, χόλος δέ μιν ἄγριος ἦρειν·)
Ἦρῃ δ' οὐκ ἔχαδε στῆθος χόλον, ἀλλὰ προσήυδα.

X 279 ἤμβροτες, οὐδ' ἄρα πῶ τι, θεοὶς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ,
ἐκ Διὸς ἠείδης τὸν ἐμὸν μόνον· ἦ τοι ἔφης γε·
(ἀλλὰ τις ἀρτιεπῆς καὶ ἐπὶ κλοπὸς ἔπλεο μύθων),
ὄφρα σ' ὑποδείσας μένεος ἀλκῆς τε λάθωμαι.

At the close of 280 a comma should stand, and not a colon, since 282 depends on ἔφης γε. 'You asserted that my death was certain, in order to frighten me.'

X 412 λαοὶ μὲν ῥα γέροντα μόγις ἔχον ἀσχαλῶντα
(ἐξελθεῖν μεμαῶτα πυλάων Δαρδανιάων)
πάντας δὲ λιτάνευε κυλινδόμενος κατὰ κόπρον.

Here ἐξελθεῖν μεμαῶτα is a repetition in different form of ἀσχαλῶντα.

X 340 ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν χαλκὸν τε αἶλις χρυσὸν τε δέδεξο
(δῶρα, τά τοι δώσουσι πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ),
σῶμα δὲ οἴκαδ' ἐμὸν δόμεναι πάλιν.

X 194 ὁσσάκι δ' ὁρμήσειε πυλάων Δαρδανιάων
(ἀντίον αἰξασθαι, ἐνδμήτους ὑπὸ πύργους),
εἴ πως οἱ καθύπερθεν ἀλάλκοιεν βελέεσσιν.

In 194, πυλάων is to be construed with the 'verb of aiming,' ὁρμήσειε, and not with the adverb ἀντίον. Compare

Ξ 488 ὠρμήθη δ' Ἀκάμαντος· ὁ δ' οὐχ ὑπέμεινεν ἐρωήν.

Δ 334 ἔστασαν, ὁππότε πύργος Ἀχαιῶν ἄλλος ἐπελθὼν
Τρώων ὁρμήσειε καὶ ἄρξειαν πολέμοιο.

Φ 595 Πηλεΐδης ὠρμήσατ' Ἀγήνορος ἀντιθέοιο.

Ο 693 ὥς Ἐκτωρ ἴθυσε νεὸς κυανοπρώροιο
ἀντίος αἰξας.

- X 199 ὥς δ' ἐν ὀνείρῳ οὐ δύναται φεύγοντα διώκειν·
(οὐτ' ἄρ' ὁ τὸν δύναται ὑποφεύγειν οὐθ' ὁ διώκειν·)
ὥς ὁ τὸν οὐ δυνατό μάρψαι ποσὶν οὐδ' ὅς ἀλύξαι.
- X 157 τῇ ῥα παραδραμέτην, ^Λφεύγων, ὁ δ' ὅπισθε διώκων¹
(πρόσθε μὲν ἐσθλὸς ἔφενγε, δίωκε δέ μιν μέγ' ἀμείνων,) ^Λ
καρπαλίμως, ἐπεὶ οὐχ ἱερόμιον οὐδὲ βοείην
ἀρνίσσθην.

The reference of καρπαλίμως 159 has troubled commentators, who generally construe the adverb with ἔφενγε. Bekker condemns 158, perhaps failing to notice how many analogies can be found for such parenthetical verses. The second hemistich of 157 — 'in flight, and the other behind in pursuit' — suggests 158.

- γ 137 τῷ δὲ καλεσσαμένῳ ἀγορὴν ἐς πάντας Ἀχαιοῖς,
(μάψ, ἀτὰρ οὐ κατὰ κόσμον, ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα,
οἱ δ' ἦλθον οἴνῳ βεβαρηότες νῆες Ἀχαιῶν,) ^Λ
μῦθον μυθείσσθην, τοῦ εἵνεκα λαὸν ἄγειραν.
- γ 191 πάντας δ' Ἰδομενεὺς Κρήτην εἰσήγαγ' ἐταίρους,
(οἱ φύγον ἐκ πολέμου, πόντος δέ οἱ οὐ τιν' ἀπηύρα.)
- γ 307 κατὰ δ' ἔκτανε πατροφονῆα,
(Αἰγισθον δολόμητιν, ὃ οἱ πατέρα κλυτὸν ἔκτα.) ^Λ
ἦ τοι ὁ τὸν κτείνας δαίνυ τάφον Ἀργείοισι.
- γ 346 Ζεὺς τό γ' ἀλεξήσειε καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι,
ὥς ὑμεῖς παρ' ἐμεῖο θοὴν ἐπὶ νῆα κίοιτε
ὥς τέ τευ ἦ παρὰ πάμπαν ἀνείμονος ἦδὲ πενιχροῦ,
(ὧ οὐ τι χλαῖναι καὶ ῥήγεα πόλλ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ,
350 οὐτ' αὐτῷ μαλακῶς οὔτε ξείνοισιν ἐνευδεῖν.) ^Λ
αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ πάρα μὲν χλαῖναι καὶ ῥήγεα καλά.
- γ 380 ἀλλὰ ἄνασσ' Ἰλῆθι, δίδωθι δέ μοι κλέος ἐσθλόν,
(αὐτῷ καὶ παιδεσσι καὶ αἰδοίῃ παράκοιτι·)
σοὶ δ' αὖ ἐγὼ ῥέξω βοῦν ἦνιν εὐρυμέτωπον
ἄδμήτην, ἣν οὐ πω ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἦγαγεν ἀνήρ.
δ 20 τῷ δ' αὐτ' ἐν προθύροισι δόμων αὐτῷ τε καὶ ἵππῳ,
(Τηλέμαχος θ' ἦρωσ καὶ Νέστορος ἀγαλὸς υἱός,) ^Λ
στῆσαν. ὁ δὲ προμολῶν ἵδετο κρείων Ἑτεωνεύς,
(ὀτρηρὸς θεράπων Μενελάου κυδαλίμοιο,) ^Λ
βῆ δ' ἵμεν ἀγγελέων διὰ δώματα ποιμῆνι λαῶν.

¹ Cf. X 200 quoted just above.

- δ 52 χέρνιβα δ' ἀμφίπολος προχόῳ ἐπέχευε φέρονσα
(καλῇ χρυσείῃ ὑπὲρ ἀργυρέοιο λέβητος)
νίψασθαι, παρὰ δὲ ξεστήν ἐτάνυσσε τράπεζαν.
- δ 602 σὺ γὰρ πεδίοιο ἀνάσσεις
(εὐρέος, ᾧ ἐνὶ μὲν λωτὸς πολὺς, ἐν δὲ κύπειρον
πυροὶ τε ζεαί τε ἰδ' εὐρυφυῆς κρῖ λευκόν.)
ἐν δ' Ἰθάκῃ οὐτ' ἄρ' δρόμοι εὐρέες οὔτε τι λειμών.
- δ 722 κλῦτε, φίλαι· πέρι γάρ μοι Ὀλύμπιος ἄλγε' ἔδωκεν
(ἐκ πασῶν, ὅσαι μοι ὁμοῦ τράφεν ἠδὲ γέγοντο·)
ἢ πρὶν μὲν πόσιν ἐσθλὸν ἀπώλεσα θυμολέοντα,
(παντοίῃς ἀρετῇσι κεκασμένον ἐν Δαναοῖσιν
ἐσθλόν, τοῦ κλέος εὐρὺ καθ' Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἄργος·)
νῦν αὖ παῖδ' ἀγαπητὸν ἀνηρείψαντο θύελλαι
ἀκλέα ἐκ μεγάρων, οὐδ' ὀρμηθέντος ἄκουσα.
- ε 5 τοῖσι δ' Ἀθηναίῃ λέγε κήδεα πόλλ' Ὀδυσῆος
(μνησασμένη· μέλε γάρ οἱ ἐὼν ἐν δώμασι νύμφης·)
“Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἦδ' ἄλλοι μάκαρες θεοὶ αἰὲν ἔοντες.”
- ε 47 εἴλετο δὲ ῥάβδον, τῇ τ' ἀνδρῶν ὄμματα θέλγει,
(ὣν ἐθέλει, τοὺς δ' αὖτε καὶ ὑπνώνοντας ἐγείρει·)
τὴν μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχων πέτετο κρατὺς ἀργεῖφόντης.
- ε 421 ἢ τί μοι καὶ κῆτος ἐπισσεύῃ μέγα δαίμων
(ἐξ ἁλός, οἷά τε πολλὰ τρέφει κλυτὸς Ἀμφιτρίτης)
οἶδα γάρ, ὥς μοι ὁδῶδυσται κλυτὸς ἐννοσίγαιος.
- ζ 232 ὥς δ' ὅτε τις χρυσὸν περιχεύεται ἀργύρῳ ἀνήρ
(Ἰδρις, ὃν Ἡφαιστος δέδαεν καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη
τέχνην παντοίην, χαρίεντα δὲ ἔργα τελεΐει),
ὥς ἄρα τῷ κατέχευε χάριν κεφαλῇ τε καὶ ὤμοις.
- ζ 278 ἦ τινὰ που πλαγχθέντα κομίσσατο ἧς ἀπὸ νηὸς
(ἀνδρῶν τηλεδαπῶν, ἐπεὶ οὐ τινες ἐγγύθεν εἰσὶν·)
. . . βέλτερον, εἰ καὶ τῇ περ ἐποικομένη πόσιν εὖρεν
(ἄλλοθεν· ἦ γὰρ τοῦσδε γ' ἀτιμάζει κατὰ δῆμον
Φαίηκας, τοί μιν μνῶνται πολέες τε καὶ ἐσθλοί).
ὥς ἐρέουσιν, ἐμοὶ δέ κ' ὀνειδέα ταῦτα γένοιτο.
- ζ 321 δύσετό τ' ἥελιος καὶ τοὶ κλυτὸν ἄλσος ἴκοντο
(ἱρὸν Ἀθηναίης, ἣν ἄρ' ἔζητο διὸς Ὀδυσσεύς).
αὐτίκ' ἔπειτ' ἡρᾶτο Διὸς κούρη μέγαλοιο·
κλυθὶ μέν, αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς τέκος, ἀτρυτώνη·
νῦν δὴ πέρ μεν ἄκουσον, ἐπεὶ πάρος οὐ ποτ' ἄκουσας
(βασιόμενου, ὅτε μ' ἔρραιε κλυτὸς ἐννοσίγαιος).

θ 372 οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν σφαῖραν καλὴν μετὰ χερσὶν ἔλοντο,
(πορφυρέην, τὴν σφιν Πόλυβος ποίησε δαίφρων,)
τὴν ἕτερος ῥίπτασκε ποτὶ νέφεα σκιόεντα.

θ 492 ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ μετάβηθι καὶ ἵππου κόσμον ἄεισον
(δουρατέον, τὸν Ἑπειὸς ἐποίησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ,)
ὃν ποτ' ἐς ἀκρόπολιν δόλον ἤγαγε διὸς Ὀδυσσεύς.

Perhaps the most noticeable of all brief Homeric parentheses is in Helen's lament,

Ω 762 “Ἐκτορ, ἐμῷ θυμῷ δαέρων πολὺ φίλτατε πάντων,
(ἦ μὲν μοι πόσις ἐστὶν Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής,
ὅς μ' ἄγαγε Τροίηνδ' ὥς πρὶν ὠφελλον ὀλέσθαι,)
765 ἦδη γὰρ νῦν μοι τόδ' ἐείκοστον ἔτος ἐστίν,
ἐξ οὗ κεῖθεν ἔβην καὶ ἐμῆς ἀπελήλυθα πάτρης.”

The failure to notice that 763 f. were parenthetical, led an editor to say that ‘Helen’s speech is all disjointed with passionate anguish’ ! Even Bekker and Nauck put a full stop at the close of 764, and thus separate 765 from πολὺ φίλτατε 762, to which it refers. Helen’s thought is simply that Hector is the dearest to her of all Priam’s sons, since during these twenty trying years he has never reproached her. But the mention of δαέρων ‘husband’s brothers,’ involuntarily causes the parenthetical exclamation, ‘Alas and indeed, Paris *is* my husband ! I wish he were not !’ 763 f. were even condemned by Düntzer as containing an ‘absurd asseveration that Paris was her husband, which no one in Troy doubted.’

PAUSE IN SENSE AT THE CAESURA.

That Homer is more inclined than the later Greek and the Roman poets to make a pause, though it be but slight, at the close of the verse, may be considered as illustrated by the foregoing examples. This pause at the close of the verse has been used properly to explain the *syllaba anceps* which is allowed there. Of the first forty lines of the Iliad, twenty end with an apparent trochee, and occasionally this is accompanied by a hiatus, as διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε || Ἀτρείδης τε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν A 6 f. The poet himself thus marks the pause as clearly as could be desired. From such a distinct metrical pause in itself we should have a right to infer an *original* pause in the thought at that point. But Homer allows at the main caesura the same metrical

freedom as at the break between two verses, viz. the *syllaba anceps* and hiatus.¹ Examples are not needed to show that hiatus is freely permitted in the third foot. Indeed, the poet seems to prefer hiatus to elision at that point, since elision would tend to bind the two parts more closely together. Compare

A 565 ἄλλ' ἀκέουσα κάθησο, ἄμῳ δ' ἐπιπείθεο μύθῳ.

That a short syllable might take the place of a long syllable, before a caesural pause, was not observed by scholars at first, since they were accustomed to explain the quantity of not a few syllables as 'lengthened under the *ictus*.' But in verses like

α 40 ἐκ γὰρ Ὀρέσταο Ἀτίσις ἔσσεται Ἀτρεΐδαο

no one need hesitate to explain the use of the final syllable of Ὀρέσταο in exactly the same way as the final syllable of Ἀτρεΐδαο. If at the close of the verse the slight following pause is sufficient to fill up the lacking quantity, and if scholars are right in saying that in this place a short syllable plus a short musical rest may be used for a long syllable, then analogy allows the assertion that at the principal caesura as well, a short syllable plus a short musical rest may be used for a long syllable. Such a musical rest in the midst of a sentence, and especially between words which are bound in close grammatical union, involves distinct emphasis upon the preceding word. This emphasis is generally fully justified by the connexion. In the verse quoted above as an illustration, α 40, Orestes is made prominent since apparently Aegisthus had no thought of danger from him, with Agamemnon slain and Menelaus out of the way. 'Nay,' said Hermes, 'Orestes will take vengeance for his father.'

The influence of the caesural pause in the verse and, hence, the importance of observing it closely in the interpretation of the poems, seem to have been too much overlooked. Editors and translators have made too little use of this aid, just as they have often neglected to observe the position of words in the verse and the separation of words by the close of the verse. The contrast at the beginning of the Twenty-second Book of the Iliad is lost or mistaken (appar-

¹ Similarly Shakspeare allows himself after the caesura the same metrical freedom as in the first foot of the verse; while before the caesura the 'double' or 'feminine' ending is allowed just as at the close of the verse.

ently) not only by such amateurs as Chapman and Lord Derby, but also by such scholars as Professor Newman and Mr. Myers.

- X 1 ὥς οἱ μὲν κατὰ ἄστυ, πεφυζότες ἤντε νεβροί,
 ἰδρὸ' ἀπεψύχοντο, πῖον τ' ἀκέοντό τε δίψαν
 κεκλιμένοι καλῇσιν ἐπάλλεσσιν· αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοί
 τείχεος ἄσπον ἴσαν, σάκε' ὤμοισι κλίναντες.
 5 Ἑκτορα δ' αὐτοῦ μείναι, ὀλοὴ μοῖρα πέδησεν
 Ἴλίου προπάρουθε, πυλάων τε Σκαϊάων.
 αὐτὰρ Πηλείωνα, προσσῆδα Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων.

Old editions generally, I think, have no punctuation within the first verse; Heyne and Wolf placed a comma after *πεφυζότες*, Bekker placed the comma after *ἄστυ*. The ordinary school-boy is divided in opinion, whether *οἱ μὲν* is contrasted with *αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοί* 3 (to this most boys incline) or with *αὐτὰρ Πηλείωνα* 7. But the poet has done his best to show that the Trojans within the city are contrasted with the one Trojan who remains before the gates. The pause in the first verse creates a strong presumption that the preceding *κατὰ ἄστυ* is contrasted with something. But *κατὰ ἄστυ* cannot be contrasted with *τείχεος ἄσπον*. Nothing remains for the contrast but *αὐτοῦ μείναι* 5, in the same position of the verse, before the caesural pause. And *αὐτοῦ* is emphatic also in itself, being prevaillingly in Homer a true intensive, — not simply ‘there,’ but ‘right there,’ — while it is rendered doubly emphatic here by the fact that the whole of the following verse is added in apposition with it, — ‘right there, before Ilios and the Scaean Gate.’ Such a contrast as the poet has made in this passage deserves to be clearly marked. Similar contrasts, which are often overlooked, may be found on almost every page of the Homeric poems. For instance,

- α 6 ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὥς ἐτάρους, ἔρρυσατο ἰέμενός περ·
 αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρησιν, ἀτασθαλίησιν ὄλοντο,
 νήπιοι, οἳ κατὰ βούς Ὑπερίονος Ἡελίοιο
 ἥσθιον· αὐτὰρ ὁ τοῖσιν, ἀφείλετο νόστιμον ἦμαρ.
 10 τῶν ἀμόθεν γε, θεὰ, θύγατερ Διός, εἰπέ καὶ ἡμῖν.

Just as truly as *ἐτάρους* is made emphatic by the following pause, so truly does *τοῖσιν* 9 receive like prominence for the sake of the same contrast, and he would be bold who should deny this of *σφετέρησιν*. In line 10, the rhythm indicates that *θύγατερ Διός* is not immediately connected with *θεά*.

In general, Homer seems to use the pause in the verse just as distinctly to mark a break or separation as the pause at the close of the verse.¹

The parenthetical nature of the second hemistich is obvious in passages like

X 25 τὸν δ' ὁ γέρων Πρίαμος πρῶτος ἶδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν
παμφαίνονθ' ὥστ' ἀστέρ' ἄπεσσύμενον πεδίοιο,
ὅς ῥά τ' ὀπώρας εἶσιν, κτλ., where the relative *ὅς* 27 refers not to *πεδίοιο*, nor to the subject of *ἄπεσσύμενον*, but to *ἀστέρα*.

Another illustration of the emphasis afforded by the caesural pause, even where no mark of punctuation could stand, is found in

X 261 "Ἐκτορ, μή μοι, ἄλαστε, συνημοσύνας ἀγόρευε.
ὥς οὐκ ἔστι λέουσι καὶ ἀνδράσιν ὀρκια πιστά,
οὐδὲ λύκοι τε καὶ ἄρνες ὁμόφρονα θυμὸν ἔχουσιν,
ἀλλὰ κακὰ φρονέουσι διαμπερὲς ἀλλήλοισιν,
265 ὥς οὐκ ἔστ' ἐμὲ καὶ σέ φιλήμεναι."

Here the comparison between *λύκοι τε καὶ ἄρνες* and *ἐμὲ καὶ σέ* is marked chiefly by the position of the two clauses before the verse-pause.

Cf. a 45 "ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη, ὕπατε κρείωντων,
καὶ λίην κείνός γε εἰκότι κείται δλέθρῳ,
ὥς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος, ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι·
ἀλλὰ μοι ἄμφ' Ὀδυσῆι δαΐφρονι δαίεται ἦτορ."

Here *κείνός γε*, καὶ *ἄλλος*, and *Ὀδυσῆι* stand immediately before the trochaic caesura of the third foot, and thus are brought into immediate connexion and contrast with each other, while in 45, *Κρονίδη* is marked as in apposition with *πάτερ*.

In a 222 οὐ μὲν τοι γενεὴν γε θεοὶ νόνημνον ὀπίσσω
θῆκαν, ἐπεὶ σέ γε τοῖον ἐγείνατο Πηνελόπεια,

the school-boy is saved from error, perhaps, if he remembers the important principle that a translation which preserves the order of

¹ I can only refer here to the works of two scholars who maintain the origin of the Homeric verse from a combination of two tetrameters: Professor F. D. Allen, Ueber den Ursprung des homerischen Versmasses, in Kuhn's Zeitschrift xxiv; and Usener, Altgriechischer Versbau. My observations have not been consciously affected by these views, although these seem very probable.

the words, but neglects to keep the exact construction, is often more literal than one which preserves the grammatical construction of the original but neglects the order of words. But after all, it is the caesura which gives the first hint that *τοῖον* is all emphatic, and that *ἐγείνατο Πηνελόπεια* is simply part of the poetic form of statement ('Penelope's son').

The first part of the verse in Homer in general bears the burden of thought. The last part of the verse is often simply illustrative and explanatory. Thus

Η 11 Ἔκτωρ δ' Ἡιονῆα βάλλ' ἔγχεϊ δ' ἐρύοντι
 αὐχέν' ὑπὸ στεφάνης ἔνχαλκου, λύσε δὲ γυῖα.
 Γλαῦκος δ' Ἴππολόχοιο πάς, Λυκίων ἀγὸς ἀνδρῶν,
 Ἴφινοον βάλε δουρὶ κατὰ κρατερὴν ὕσμινην
 Δεξιὰ δ' ἐπὶ πῶν ἐπιαλμένων ὠκείων,
 ὦμον ὃ δ' ἐξ ἵππων χαμάδις πέσε, λύντο δὲ γυῖα.

In most such cases, although not always, the line between the necessary and the ornamental and picturesque part of the verse is drawn at the caesura in the third foot.

α 11 ἐνθ' ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες, ὅσοι φύγον αἰπὴν ὀλεθρον,
 οἶκοι ἔσαν πόλεμόν τε πεφευγότες ἤδ' ἐθάλασσαν·
 τὸν δ' οἶον νόστου κεχρημένον ἤδ' ἐγυναικὸς
 νύμφη πότνι ἔρυκε Καλυψώ διὰ θεῶν
 15 ἐν σπείσσι γλαφυροῖσι, λιλαιομένη πόσιν εἶναι.
 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ἔτος ἦλθε περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν,
 τῷ οἱ ἐπεκλώσαντο θεοὶ οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι κτλ.

The last part of each of these verses is not otiose. It is not padding, nor a mere tag. To omit it would be to reduce poetry to prose. Beginners often can see the difference between the Homeric and the prosaic form of statement most easily by the simple device of omitting the last half-verse.

Other illustrations are not far to seek.

Α 8 τίς τ' ἄρ σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι;
 Λητοῦς καὶ Διὸς νιός· ὁ γὰρ βασιλῆϊ χολωθεὶς
 10 νοῦσον ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὥρσε κακῆν, ὀλέκοντο δὲ λαοί,
 οὐνεκα τὸν Χρῦσῃν ἠτίμασεν ἀρητῆρα
 Ἀτρεΐδης. ὁ γὰρ ἦλθε θεῶν ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν
 λυσόμενος τε θυγάτρα φέρων τ' ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα,
 στέμμα τ' ἔχων ἐν χερσὶν ἐκὼν βόλου Ἀπόλλωνος

- 15 χρυσέῳ ἀνὰ σκήπτρῳ, καὶ ἐλίσσετο πάντας Ἀχαιοῖς,
 Ἀτρεΐδα δὲ μάλιστα ᾠδύν, κοσμήτορε λαῶν.
 “Ἀτρεΐδαι τε καὶ ἄλλοι ἔνκνημιδες Ἀχαιοί,
 ὑμῖν μὲν θεοὶ δοῖεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ’ ἔχοντες
 ἐκπέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, ἐν δ’ οἴκαδ’ ἱκέσθαι.
 20 παῖδα δ’ ἐμοὶ λύσαιτε φίλῃν τὰ τ’ ἄποινα δέχεσθαι
 ἄξιόμενοι Διὸς υἱὸν ἐκὼν ἑβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα.”

In two of these verses the pause as marked does not coincide with the usual punctuation, but perhaps that is so much the worse for the usual punctuation! Certainly in 10, the position of *κακὴν*, following its noun and separated from it, can be explained only on the ground that the adjective is added as an appositive to *νοῦσον* and is introductory to the following clause, — exactly in accordance with the use of adjectives at the beginning of a verse, which has been shown above (p. 98). Thus also *φίλῃν* 20 is much more pathetic in its present place than if it followed *παῖδα* immediately. ‘Release to me my daughter, my dear daughter!’ If any one were still tempted to think *φίλῃν* a mere possessive pronoun, he would be sorely perplexed to account for its position here. In 16, *δύν* is commonly construed with Ἀτρεΐδα, but in some early editions it was connected with *κοσμήτορε*, as is reasonable enough; cf. ὦ διπλοὶ στρατηλάται, | Ἀγάμεμνον, ὦ Μενέλαε Soph. Phil. 793 f., τῶν Ἀτρέως | διπλῶν στρατηγῶν *ib.* 1023, δισσοὶ στρατηγοὶ *ib.* 264. The order of words as well as the rhythm throws the numeral with what follows. The pause in 21 shows Ἀπόλλωνα to be in apposition with Διὸς υἱόν, and that in 18 would indicate that Ὀλύμπια δώματ’ ἔχοντες is in apposition with θεοί. Similarly the pause in 17 would separate ἄλλοι from the rest of the verse, which follows as an appositive: ‘Ye sons of Atreus and ye others, — well-greaved Achaeans!’ With this last passage may be compared passages like ἦ ἐς Ἀθηναίης ἐξοίχεται, ἔνθα περ ἄλλαι | Τρωαὶ ἐνπλόκαμοι δεινὴν θεὸν ἱλάσκονται Z 379 f., where the appositive follows at the beginning of a new verse, and α 128, 132, quoted on p. 104.

- A 223 Πηλεΐδης δ’ ἐξαῦτις ἄταρτήροις ἐπέεσσιν
 Ἀτρεΐδην προσέειπε, καὶ οὐ πω λῆγε χόλοιο.
 225 “οἶνοβαρές, κυνὸς ὄμματ’ ἔχων, κραδίην δ’ ἐλάφοιο,
 οὔτε ποτ’ ἐς πόλεμον ἄμα λαῶ θωρηχθῆναι
 οὔτε λόχονδ’ ἱέναι σὺν ἀριστήεσσιν Ἀχαιῶν
 τέτληκας θυμῷ· τὸ δέ τοι κῆρ εἴδεται εἶναι.
 ἦ πολὺ λώϊόν ἐστι κατὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν

- 230 δῶρ' ἀποαιρείσθαι, ἄς τις σέθεν ἀντίον ἔπη·
 δημοβόρος βασιλεύς, ἔπει οὐτιδανοῖσιν ἀνάσσεις·
 ἦ γὰρ ἂν, Ἀτρεΐδῃ, νῦν ὕστατα λωβήσαιο.
 ἀλλ' ἔκ τοι ἐρέω, καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμοῦμαι."

In nine of the above eleven verses, the part after the caesura in the third foot is not needed for sense or grammatical construction. In the other two verses, the caesura in the third foot is distinctly marked; even in 225, the emphasis falls on *κυνὸς ὄμματα* as contrasted with *κραδίην ἐλάφοιο*.

- Γ 293 καὶ τοὺς μὲν κατέθηκεν, ἐπὶ χθονὸς ἀσπαίροντας,
 θυμοῦ δευόμενους· ἀπὸ γὰρ μένος εἴλετο χαλκός·
 295 οἶνον δ' ἐκ κρητῆρος, ἀφυσσόμενοι δεπάεσσιν
 ἔκχεον, ἥδ' εὗχοντο, θεοῖς αἰειγενέτησιν.
 ὦδε δέ τις εἴπεσκεν, Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε.
 Α 248 τὸν δ' ὥς οὖν ἐνόησε, Κῶν ἀριδείκετος ἀνδρῶν
 πρεσβυγενὴς Ἀντηνορίδης, κρατερόν ῥά ἐ πένθος
 250 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐκάλυψε, κασιγνήτοιο πεσόντος.
 στή δ' εὐράξ σὺν δουρὶ λαθὼν Ἀγαμέμνονα δῖον,
 νύξε δέ μιν κατὰ χεῖρα, μέσην, ἀγκῶνος ἔνερθεν,
 ἀντικρὺς δὲ διέσχε, φαινοῦ δουρὸς ἀκωκή.
 ῥίγησέν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα, ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων·
 255 ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὥς ἀπέληγε, μάχης ἥδ' ἐπτολέμοιο,
 ἀλλ' ἐπόρουσε Κῶνι, ἔχων ἀνεμοτρεφὲς ἔγχος.
 ἦ τοι ὁ Ἴφιδάμαντα, κασίγνητον καὶ ὄπατρον
 ἔλκε ποδὸς μεμαῶς, καὶ αὐτεὶ πάντας ἀρίστους·
 τὸν δ' ἔλκοντ' ἂν ὄμιλον, ὑπ' ἀσπίδος ὁμφαλοέσσης
 260 οὕτησε ξυστῶ, χαλκῆρέϊ, λῦσε δὲ γυῖα.

In 252, *μέσην* is clearly added in close connexion with *ἀγκῶνος ἔνερθεν*. Cf. *κακὴν*, ὀλέκοντο δὲ λαοὶ Α 10 (see p. 118). In 260, the case is not so clear; but since the sense is complete after *ξυστῶ*, the verse reasonably may be held to have two caesuras, — the penthemimeral as well as the bucolic. In twelve of the thirteen verses, the burden of thought is in the first half-verse.

- Χ 499 “δακρυόεις δέ τ' ἀνείσι, παῖς ἐς μητέρα χήρην,
 Ἀστυάναξ, ὃς πρὶν μὲν, ἐοῦ ἐπὶ γούνασι πατρὸς
 μυελὸν οἶον ἔδεσκε, καὶ οἶων πίονα δημόν·
 αὐτὰρ ὅθ' ὕπνος ἔλοι, παύσαιτό τε νηπιαχεύων,
 εὖδεσκέ' ἐν λέκτροισιν, ἐν ἀγκαλίδεσσιν τιθήνης,
 εὐνῇ ἐνὶ μαλακῇ, θαλέων ἐμπλησάμενος κῆρ.

505 νῦν δ' ἂν πολλὰ πάθῃσι, ^Λ φίλον ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἁμαρτῶν,
 Ἄστυνάαξ, ὃν Τρῶες ἐπύκλῃσιν καλέουσιν.
 οἶος γάρ σφιν ἔρυστο πύλας καὶ τείχεα μακρά.
 νῦν δέ σέ μέν παρὰ νηυσὶ ^Λ κορωνίσιν, νόσφι τοκῆων,
 αἰόλαι εὐλαὶ ἔδονται, ^Λ ἐπεὶ κε κύνες κορέσωνται,
 510 γυμνόν· ἀτάρ τοι εἴματ' ἐνὶ μεγάροισι κέονται,
 λεπτά τε καὶ χαρίεντα, ^Λ τετυγμένα χερσὶ γυναικῶν.
 ἀλλ' ἦ τοι τάδε πάντα καταφλέξω πυρὶ κηλέῳ,
 οὐδὲν σοὶ γ' ὄφελος, ^Λ ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐγκείσεται αὐτοῖς,
 ἀλλὰ πρὸς Τρώων καὶ Τρωιάδων κλέος εἶναι."
 515 ὥς ἔφατο κλαίονσ', ^Λ ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναῖκες.

In twelve of these seventeen verses, the second hemistich is not strictly necessary ; but it is far from being mere padding or a collection of tags. Indeed no one of these half-verses is used as a formula. The life and poetry of the picture would be gone if they were omitted. How prosaic is : *δακρύνεις δέ τ' ἄνγεισι Ἄστυνάαξ, ὃς πρὶν μὲν μυελὸν οἶον ἔδεσκε, αὐτὰρ ὅθ' ὕπνος ἔλοι, εὐδεσκ' ἐν λέκτροισιν, εὐνῇ ἐνὶ μαλακῇ, νῦν δ' ἂν πολλὰ πάθῃσι !* In this we lose the pictures of the return of the boy to his widowed mother, of the child on his father's knees, of the childish plays, and of the nurse's care. So in the first verses of the Twenty-second Book, quoted on p. 115, the parenthetical second hemistich contains the comparison with fawns, the scene of the Trojans slaking their thirst and that of the Achaeans bracing their shields against their shoulders as they approached the walls.

δ 401 “τῆμος ἄρ' ἐξ ἁλὸς εἰσι ^Λ γέρων ἄλιος νημερτῆς
 πνοιῇ ὑπὸ Ζεφύροιο ^Λ μελαίνῃ φρικὶ καλυφθεῖς,
 ἐκ δ' ἐλθὼν κοιμᾶται ^Λ ὑπὸ σπέσσι γλαφυροῖσιν·
 ἀμφὶ δέ μιν φῶκαι ^Λ νέποδες καλῆς ἁλοσύνης
 ἀθρόαι εὐδουσιν, ^Λ πολυῆς ἁλὸς ἐξαναδύσαι,
 πικρὸν ἀποπνέουσιν ^Λ ἁλὸς πολυβενθέος ὁδμήν.
 ἔνθα σ' ἐγὼν ἀγαγοῦσα ^Λ ἄμ' ἡοὶ φαινομένηφιν
 εὐνάσω ἐξείης.”

κ 526 ὥς ἐφάμην, ὁ δ' ἔπειτα ^Λ Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι
 εὔχετο χεῖρ' ὀρέγων ^Λ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα·
 “κλῦθι Ποσειδάων ^Λ γαίηοιχε κυανοχαῖτα,
 εἰ ἐτεόν γε σὸς εἰμι, ^Λ πατήρ δ' ἐμὸς εὔχεται εἶναι,
 δὸς μὴ Ὀδυσσῆα πτολιπόρθητον οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι” κτλ.

μ 29 “ὥς τότε μὲν πρόπαν ἤμαρ ^Λ ἥελιον καταδύντα
 ἤμεθα δαινύμενοι ^Λ κρέα τ' ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἡδύ·

ἦμος δ' ἥλιος κατέδυ^Λκαὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἦλθεν,
οἱ μὲν κοιμήσαντο^Λπαρὰ πρυμνήσια νηός,
ἡ δ' ἐμέ χεῖρὸς ἐλοῦσα^Λφίλων ἀπονόσφιν ἑταίρων
εἰσέ τε καὶ προσέλεκτο^Λκαὶ ἐξερέεινεν ἅπαντα."

In Ψ 83 "μὴ ἐμὰ σὼν ἀπάνευθε τιθήμεναι ὅστέ", Ἀχιλλεῦ^Λ
ἀλλ' ὁμοῦ, ὥς τράφομέν^Λπερ^Λἐν ὑμετέροισι δόμοισιν,"

the thought clearly is, 'Place our bones together, just as we were brought up [together], in your home.' ὥς τράφομέν^Λπερ is to be construed more closely with what precedes than with what follows, and the ordinary punctuation is misleading.

In Ψ 241 ἐν μέσση γὰρ ἔκειτο πυρῇ, τοὶ δ' ἄλλοι ἀνευθεν^Λ
ἔσχατι^Λκαίοντ'^Λἐπιμῖξ, ἵπποι τε καὶ ἄνδρες,

the pause in the third foot of 242 is made probable also by the similar verse

Φ 16 πλῆτο ῥόος κελάδων^Λἐπιμῖξ ἵππων τε καὶ ἀνδρῶν.

Early editions have no punctuation in either of these verses. The comma in Ψ 242 seems to be the work of Wolf. Of recent editors, Düntzer (whose punctuation is often thoughtful) alone places the comma before ἐπιμῖξ.

In μ 206 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ διὰ νηὸς ἰὼν ὤτρυνον ἑταίρους
μειλιχίους ἐπέεσσι^Λπαρασταδὸν ἄνδρα ἕκαστον.

ἄνδρα ἕκαστον is probably not to be construed in apposition with ἑταίρους, but directly with παρασταδόν, which is equivalent to παραστάς.

THE SECOND HALF-VERSE PARALLEL TO THE FIRST.

The second half-verse often repeats the thought of the first half-verse in more definite, picturesque form. Thus in

X 5 Ἔκτορα δ' αὐτοῦ μέναι ὀλοὴ μοῖρα πέδῃσεν
Ἴλίου προπάροιθε^Λπυλάων τε Σκαίῳ,

the statement 'before Ilios' is comparatively colorless, while the addition, 'and the Scaean Gate,' brings to the hearer's mind the company of elders with Priam on the Tower, and the throng of women who are watching what is done on the field below.

In X 52 εἰ δ' ἤδη τεθνᾶσι^Λκαὶ εἰν Ἀῖδαο δόμοισιν,

the second half-verse added nothing to the hearer's information; if these youths were dead, of course they were in the home of Hades;

but *τεθνῶσι* seems neutral and dull, while *εἰν Ἀΐδαο δόμοισιν* brings a scene before the mind at once. Such parallelism is frequent in Homer. Compare

- Z 6 Τρώων ῥῆξε φάλαγγα, ^Λφώως δ' ἐτάροισιν ἔθηκεν.
 Z 46 ζώγρει, Ἀτρεὺς νιέ, ^Λσὺ δ' ἄξια δέξαι ἄποινα.
 Z 82 φεύγοντας πεσέειν, ^Λδηίοισι δὲ χάρμα γενέσθαι.
 Z 106 οἱ δ' ἐλελίχθησαν, ^Λκαὶ ἐναντίοι ἔσταν Ἀχαιῶν.
 Z 107 Ἀργεῖοι δ' ὑπεχώρησαν, ^Λλῆξαν δὲ φόνοιο.
 Z 112 ἄνδρες ἔστε, φίλοι, ^Λμνήσασθε δὲ θοιυρίδος ἀλκῆς.
 Z 115 δαίμοσιν ἀρήσασθαι, ^Λὑποσχέσθαι δ' ἐκατόμβας.
 Z 174 ἐννήμαρ ξείνισσε, ^Λκαὶ ἐννέα βοῦς ἱέρευσεν.
 Z 202 ὃν θυμὸν κατέδωκ, ^Λπάτον ἀνθρώπων ἀλεείνων.
 Z 206 Ἴππόλοχος δ' ἔμ' ἔτικτε, ^Λκαὶ ἐκ τοῦ φημὶ γενέσθαι.
 Z 208 αἶεν ἀριστεύειν, ^Λκαὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων.
 Z 236 χρύσεια χαλκείων, ^Λἐκατόμβοι' ἐννεαβοίων.
 Z 265 μή μ' ἀπογνιώσῃς, ^Λμένεος δ' ἀλκῆς τε λάθωμαι.
 Z 387 τείρεσθαι Τρώας, ^Λμέγα δὲ κράτος εἶναι Ἀχαιῶν.
 Z 434 ἀμβρατός ἐστι πόλις, ^Λκαὶ ἐπίδρομον ἐπλετο τείχος.
 X 72 ἀρηκταμένω, ^Λδεδαιγμένω ὀξεί χαλκῷ,
 X 231 ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ στέωμεν, ^Λκαὶ ἀλεξώμεσθα μένοντε.
 X 475 ἦ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀμπνυτο, ^Λκαὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη.
 Ω 261 ψεύσται τ' ὀρχησται τε, ^Λχοροῖτις πῆρσιν ἄριστοι.
 Ω 487 τηλίκου ὥς περ ἐγών, ^Λὄλοῷ ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῶ.
 Ω 639 ἀλλ' αἰεὶ στενάχω, ^Λκαὶ κήδεα μυρία πέσσω.
 Ω 713 καὶ νῦν κε δὴ πρόπαν ἤμαρ, ^Λἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα.
 Ω 766 ἐξ οὗ κείμεν ἔβην, ^Λκαὶ ἐμῆς ἀπελήλυθα πάτρης.

The number of verses in which the second hemistich is parallel to the first, would appear considerably greater if those be added in which the parallelism is not so exact, as in

- Z 142 εἰ δέ τις ἔσσι βροτῶν, ^Λοἱ ἀρούρης καρπὸν ἔδουσιν.
 Z 354 ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν εἰσελθε, ^Λκαὶ ἔζεο τῷδ' ἐπὶ δίφρῳ.
 Z 431 ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἐλάαιρε, ^Λκαὶ αὐτοῦ μίμν' ἐπὶ πύργῳ.
 In M 13 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μὲν Τρώων θάνον ὅσοι ἄριστοι,
 πολλοὶ δ' Ἀργείων, ^Λοἱ μὲν δάμεν οἱ δὲ λίποντο,
 πέρθετο δὲ Πριάμοιο πόλις δεκάτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ,

the usual punctuation of 14 is misleading, since the second half-verse is wholly parenthetical, thrown in as a side remark: 'But when all the bravest of the Trojans were slain, and many of the Argives (some of these Argives were slain, it is true, but some were left),' etc.

Another marked example of the parenthetical use of the second half-verse is

Σ 192 ἄλλον δ' οὐ τευ οἶδα, — τεῦ ἂν κλυτὰ τεύχεα δύω;
εἰ μὴ Αἴαντός γε σάκος Τελαμωνιάδαο.

The ordinary comment that 'τεῦ is used for the relative τοῦ or ὅτεν' explains nothing, and all conjectural emendations are uncertain; but the passage is not only intelligible but natural when the second half-verse is understood as an independent, impatient question.

In the passages which immediately precede, the second half-verse is parenthetical (and so marked by the caesura), exactly as whole verses are often parenthetical. (See p. 110.)

The caesural pause in the third foot often gives the clue to the true construction of words which at first sight appear equally well connected with what precedes or what follows; it frequently separates words which are not in the same construction and yet have a similar form. For instance, in

A 29 τῆν δ' ἐγὼ οὐ λύσω· πρὶν μιν καὶ γῆρας ἔπεισιν
ἡμετέρῳ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ, ἔν' Ἀργεῖ, τηλόθι πάτρης,

ἐν Ἀργεῖ is in apposition with ἐνὶ οἴκῳ and is followed by a second appositive, τηλόθι πάτρης. We should not construe 'in our house at Argos.' Compare for the double apposition

X 156 καὶ πρὶν, ἐπ' εἰρήνης, ἄπρην ἐλθεῖν νῆας Ἀχαιῶν,
X 179 ἄνδρα, θνητὸν ἰόντα, ἄπάλαι πεπρωμένον αἶσῃ,
Ω 199 κείσ' ἰέναι, ἐπὶ νῆας, ἄῤῥω στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν,
Ω 614 νῦν δέ που ἐν πέτρῃσιν, ἔν' οὖρεσιν οἰοπόλοισιν,
ἐν Σιπύλῳ, ὅθι φασὶ θεάων ἔμμεναι εὐνάς.

Above, in X 156, 179, Ω 199, the punctuation is here changed to accord with the observation made just before.

The poet often gives a hint to the true construction by using the caesura as a separating bar.

An easy case of separation by the pause in the verse is

α 307 ξείν', ἧ τοι μὲν ταῦτα, φίλα φρονέων ἀγορεύεις,

where the caesura separates ταῦτα from φίλα, and thus connects it properly with ἀγορεύεις. Compare the following:

X 283 οὐ μὲν μοι φεύγοντι, μεταφρένῳ ἐν δόρῳ πῆξεις,
ἀλλ' ἰθὺς μεμαῶτι, διὰ στήθεσφιν ἔλασσον.

Clearly the two participles *φεύγοντι* and *μεμαῶτι* contain the sum of the matter: 'I will not flee, but will press straight forward.' This emphatic contrast (which is neglected by one of the best modern translators of the *Iliad*) is marked by the verse-pause; but in addition, in 283, the pause separates *φεύγοντι* from *μεταφρένω* at the first glance, and connects it with *μοί*.

- X 395 ἦ ῥα καὶ Ἑκτορα δῖον ^Λ αἰεκέα μῆδετο ἔργα.
 X 291 τῆλε δ' ἀπεπλάγχθη ^Λ σάκεος δόρυ. χώσατο δ' Ἑκτωρ
 ὅττι ῥά οἱ βέλος ὠκύ ^Λ ἐτώσιον ἔκφυγε χείρος.

Here the predicate construction of *ἐτώσιον* is indicated by the caesura.

- X 256 οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ σ' ἔκπαλιν ^Λ αἰεκιῶ, αἶ κεν ἐμοὶ Ζεὺς
 δῶή καμμονίην, ^Λ σὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ἀφέλωμαι.

Here *ἔκπαλιν* is better taken in apposition with *σέ* ('thee, the mighty warrior,' cf. also of Achilles,

- Φ 589 ὦδ' ἔκπαλτος ἐὼν καὶ θαρσαλέος πολεμοστής,
 and A 146 ἥ ἐ σὺ, Πηλείδην, πάντων ἐκπαλότατ' ἀνδρῶν),
 than as adverbial or cognate accusative with *αἰεκιῶ*.

- Θ 133 βροντήσας δ' ἄρα δεινὸν ^Λ ἀφῆκ' ἀργῆτα κεραυνόν.

The Homeric scholar feels at once that *δεινόν* is cognate accusative with *βροντήσας*, and that the mere order of words is sufficient to separate it from *ἀργῆτα κεραυνόν*, but the beginner, who expects essentially the same arrangement of words in Homer as in Vergil, is helped by noticing the intimation offered by the verse-pause. Similar is

- Z 182 δεινὸν ἀποπνεύουσα ^Λ πυρὸς μένος αἰθομένοιο.

Here *δεινόν* is not in direct agreement with *πυρὸς μένος*, but the second half-verse is in apposition with *δεινόν*, as cognate accusative with *ἀποπνεύουσα*.

- Ω 670 σχίσω γὰρ πόλεμον ^Λ τόσσον χρόνον ὅσσον ἄνωγας.
 β 266 μνηστήρες δὲ μάλιστα ^Λ κακῶς ὑπερηγορόεντες.
 β 298 βῆ δ' ἰέναι πρὸς δῶμα ^Λ φίλον τετιημένος ἦτορ.
 γ 88 κείνου δ' αὖ καὶ ὀλεθρον ^Λ ἀπευθέα θῆκε Κρονίων.

In many passages besides those which have been cited, the true poetic order of thought is brought out by the rhythm of the verse, as

γ 83 πατὴρ ἐμοῦ κλέος εὐρὺ μετέρχομαι, ἦν ποῦ ἀκούσω
 δίου Ὀδυσσεύος, ταλασίφρονος ὃν ποτὲ φασιν
 σὺν σοὶ μαρνάμενον Τρώων πόλιν ἐξαπατάσαι,

where ταλασίφρονος 84, 'the stout-hearted warrior,' is in apposition with Ὀδυσσεύος. So also

γ 109 ἔνθα μὲν Αἴας κείτῃ ἀρήϊος, ἔνθα δ' Ἀχιλλεύς,

where the passage becomes prosaic if it is understood as if the order were ἀρήϊος Αἴας.

γ 165 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ σὺν νηυσὶν ἀολλέσιν, αἶ μοι ἔποντο,
 φεῦγον, ἐπεὶ γίγνωσκον, ὃ δὴ κακὰ μῆδετο δαίμων.

In 165, the comma is needed before ἀολλέσιν, much rather than after it. The adjective is here essentially equivalent to the prose πᾶσιν. With this should be compared the similar use of adjectives at the beginning of the verse. (See p. 98.)

Ιν κ 395 ἄνδρες δ' ἅψ' ἐγένοντο, νεώτεροι ἢ ἄρως ἦσαν

(of the comrades of Odysseus whom Circe had turned into swine), the emphasis is confused by the usual comma after νεώτεροι. All the emphasis is laid by the poet upon the first half-verse, 'they became men again.'

Ιν Ω 650 ἐκτὸς μὲν δὴ λέξο, γέρον φίλε, μή τις Ἀχαιῶν
 ἐνθάδ' ἐπέλθῃσιν, βουληφόρος, οἷ τέ μοι αἰεὶ
 βουλὰς βουλευούσι παρήμενοι, ἣ θέμις ἐστίν,

βουληφόρος is equivalent to βουληφόρων, — 'lest some Achaean should come hither, one of the counsellors,' etc.

Ιν Μ 330 τῷ δ' ἰθὺς βήτην, Λυκίων μέγα ἔθνος ἄγοντε,

the pause again gives the first hint of warning against construing Λυκίων with ἰθὺς. Compare also

Β 321 ὥς οὖν δεινὰ πέλωρα, θεῶν εἰσὶ γὰρ ἑκατόμβας.

δ 402 πνοιῇ ὑπὸ Ζεφύροιο, μελαίνῃ φρικὴ καλυφθεῖς.

Π 180 παρθένιος τὸν ἔτικτε, χορῶ καλῇ Πολυμήλῃ.

Here the construction of χορῶ καλῇ is made definite and amplified by the following

ἡράσατ', ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδὼν μετὰ μελπομένησιν
 ἐν χορῶ Ἀρτέμιδος.

In Z 278 *ἄγριον αἰχμητὴν ἄκρατερόν μῆστωρα φόβοιο*,

the usual punctuation, a comma after *αἰχμητὴν*, is surely better than Ameis-Hentze's former punctuation, commas after *ἄγριον* and *κράτερόν*.

CONCLUSIONS.

We find, then, that in the Homeric poems much which at first sight seems tautological and is often explained as such, is really in apposition with what has preceded, and is marked as an appositive by the verse. These appositive additions do much to make a picturesque scene and to mark emotion. We find, also, that the true construction is often indicated by the pause at the close of the verse, and by that in the third foot. The caesura is in many cases the most immediate clue that the verse affords to the construction. The beginner repeatedly is saved the comparison of different passages by noting the rhythm of the verse. We find, moreover, that the right contrast is marked clearly again and again by the caesura. Translators and commentators in general have paid too little attention to this matter, and have thus lost many delicate Homeric touches of emphasis and contrast. We have seen that the traditional punctuation may be changed in some places to the advantage of the text.

The examples which have been given in this paper of the relation of the rhythm to the thought, have been taken almost at random from a great mass of illustrative material. They may easily be multiplied. This paper does not claim, however, that the sense is complete at the close of every verse in Homer, nor that the caesura in every verse is significant. But in addition to a large number of verses where the pause in the third foot corresponds to a musical 'hold' rather than to a musical 'rest,'—falling between two words which are closely connected grammatically, but the first of which is distinctly emphatic,—in the Twenty-second Book of the Iliad, I find that the second half-verse is not needed for the grammatical construction, but is simply picturesque, in about 145 verses of 515. And this is in a book which is noticeably free from 'tags'; a book in which no Greek hero but Achilles is even named, and in which appear no *κάρη κομώντες Ἀχαιοί, ἐκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοί, Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων*, or *ἱππόδαμοι Τρῶες*. In the First Book of the Iliad I count about 175 such verses out of 611. Thus in these two books, about

29 per cent. of the verses have a clearly marked appositive element in the second hemistich. In the first 700 lines of Vergil's Aeneid, I find that not more than about 14 per cent. are of this character. Vergil, then, seems to have less than one-half as many of these picturesque additions, in which rests so much that is characteristic of Homer's poetry. This appears to prove the thesis which was maintained on an earlier page, that the caesuras of Vergil, and thus the scanning of Vergil, are far less important for the thought than the caesuras and scanning of Homer.

In the portion of Hesiod which I have examined with a view to these picturesque additions, I found that about 20 per cent. of the verses have such picturesque hemistichs as have been described above. In Apollonius of Rhodes, the proportion falls to about 10 per cent., — varying in the passages examined, from 9 to 12 per cent., — or fewer even than Vergil has. Apollonius, also, carries the construction of one verse over to the following, with all the freedom which Vergil used after him.

In the first hundred lines of the Dionysiaca of Nonnus, I find only half a dozen of the second hemistichs which are not needed for grammatical construction, and these are not clearly marked. Nonnus, as all know, followed Homer in many respects with much original genius, and returned to the early preference for the feminine caesura and for an abundance of dactyls, but he did not follow Homer at all in making each line a sort of unit and giving much weight to the verse-pause.

In Quintus Smyrnaeus is found about as large a proportion as in Vergil of these picturesque half-verses. But in the *Hero and Leander* of Musaeus, such hemistichs are rare, and indeed, as a rule, there the second half-verse contains the more emphatic words and the burden of thought.

The opening verses of the later Greek epics will form a clear contrast with the early verses of the Iliad and Odyssey, as discussed on pages 95, 98, 115, 117, and are therefore appended for easy comparison.

Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica* i. 1-7: —

ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε, παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν
μνήσομαι, οἳ Πόντοιο κατὰ στόμα καὶ διὰ πέτρας
Κυανέας βασιλῆος ἐφημοσύνη Πελίαο

χρύσειον μετὰ κῶας ἐύζυγον ἤλασαν Ἄργῳ.
 5 τοίην γὰρ Πελίδης φάτιν ἔκλυεν, ὥς μιν ὀπίσσω
 μοῖρα μένει στυγερή, τοῦδ' ἀνέρος ὄντιν' ἴδοιτο
 δημόθεν οἰοπέδιλον ὑπ' ἐννεσίησι δαμῆναι.

In this passage no second half-verse could be omitted, and the thought of the first sentence is not complete even grammatically until the close of the fourth verse.

Nonnus Panopolitanus, *Dionysiaca*, i. 1-10:—

εἰπέ, θεά, Κρονίδαο διάκτορον αἶθρος αἰγῆς
 νυμφιδίῳ σπινθῆρι μογοστόκον ἄσθμα κερανοῦ
 καὶ στεροπῇν Σεμέλης θαλαμηπόλον, εἰπὲ δὲ φύλῃν
 Βάκχου δισσοτόκοιο, τὸν ἐκ πυρὸς ὕγρον αἰέρας
 5 Ζεὺς βρέφος ἡμιτέλεστον ἀμαιεύτοιο τεκοῦσης,
 φειδομέναις παλάμησι τομῇν μηροῖο χαράξας,
 ἄρσενι γαστρὶ λόχευσε πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ,
 εὖ εἰδὼς τόκον ἄλλον ἐφ' ἡμιγόνοντι καρήνῳ
 ὥς πάρος ὄγκον ἄπιστον ἔχων ἐγκύμονι κόρῳ
 10 τεύχεσιν ἀστράπτουσιν ἀνηκόντιζεν Ἀθήνην.

Quintus Smyrnaeus, *Posthomerica* i. 1-9:—

εὖθ' ὑπὸ Πηλείωνι δάμῃ θεοείκελος Ἔκτωρ,
 καὶ ἐ πυρὴ κατέδαψε, καὶ ὁστέα γαῖα κεκύνθει,
 δὴ τότε Τρῶες ἔμμιμον ἀνὰ Πριάμοιο πόλιν,
 δειδυότες μένος ἥν θρασυφρονος Αἰακίδαο·
 5 ἥντ' ἐνὶ ξυλόχοισι βόες βλοσυροῖο λέοντος
 ἐλθέμεν οὐκ ἐθέλουσιν ἐναντία, ἀλλὰ φέβονται
 ἰληδὸν πτώσσουσαι ἀνὰ ῥωπήμια πυκνά·
 ὥς οἱ ἀνὰ πτολίεθρον ὑπέτρεσαν ὄβριμον ἄνδρα,
 μνησάμενοι προτέρων, ὁπόσων ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἴαψεν.

Musaeus, *de Herone et Leandro* 1-9:—

εἰπέ, θεά, κρυφίῳ ἐπιμάρτυρα λύχρον ἐρώτων
 καὶ νύχιον πλωτῆρα θαλασσοπόρον ἡμεναίων
 καὶ γάμον ἀχλυόεντα, τὸν οὐκ ἴδεν ἄφθιτος Ἥως,
 καὶ Σηστόν καὶ Ἄβυδον, ὅπῃ γάμος ἐννυχος Ἥροῦς.
 5 νηχόμενόν τε Λέανδρον ὁμοῦ καὶ λύχρον ἀκούω,
 λύχρον ἀπαγγέλλοντα διακτορίην Ἀφροδίτης,
 Ἥροῦς νυκτιγάμοιο γαμοστόλον ἀγγελιώτην,
 λύχρον, ἔρωτος ἀγαλμα, τὸν ὦφελεν αἰθέριος Ζεὺς
 ἐννύχιον μετ' ἄεθλον ἄγειν ἐς ὁμήγυριν ἀστρων.

Compare further the proem of the *Batrachomyomachia*: —

ἀρχόμενος πρῶτον Μουσῶν χορὸν ἐξ Ἑλικῶνος
 ἐλθεῖν εἰς ἐμὸν ἦτορ ἐπεύχομαι εἵνεκ' αἰοιδῆς,
 ἦν νέον ἐν δέλτοις ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ γούνασι θῆκα,
 δῆριν ἀπειρεσίην, πολεμόκλονον ἔργον Ἄρης,
 5 εὐχόμενος μερόπεςσιν ἐς οὐατα πᾶσι βαλέσθαι,
 πῶς μύες ἐν βατράχοισιν ἀριστεύσαντες ἔβησαν,
 γηγενέων ἀνδρῶν μιμούμενοι ἔργα Γιγάντων,
 ὥς ἔπος ἐν θνητοῖσιν ἔην· τοίην δ' ἔχεν ἀρχήν.

The reader notices at once in this last passage the un-Homeric obtrusion of the poet's personality, and the prominence of the fact that the poem was *written* on tablets. Almost as distinct evidence as the foregoing, if it were needed, for the late authorship of the *Batrachomyomachia* is the long delay in presenting the theme of the work ; the first sentence is not complete until the close of the sixth verse. I may call attention also to the total lack of poetical or rhetorical emphasis at the caesura in the third foot ; the fourth verse alone has a true pause there.

Even a superficial examination shows at once the impossibility of applying to these later poets the principles which have been urged in this paper as fixing important elements of Homeric style. These principles, then, may fairly be counted characteristic of the early age of Greek epic poetry.